

# THE REFERENCE SHELF

is published to make available when needed good debates, collections of articles, briefs, bibliographies and study outlines on timely subjects for public discussion. Each number is devoted to a single subject. To make the material available at the time of greatest need, publication is irregular. Each volume contains seven or more separate issues, about 1500 pages in all, and now covers a year in time. Single numbers, 90c unless otherwise noted.

The Reference Shelf is listed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Education Index, Industrial Arts Index, and Cumulative Book Index.

*Future Issues To Be Announced.*

## Volume XVI. \$6

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>No.<br/>1. Representative American Speeches: 1941-1942. A. C. Baird. \$1.25.</p> | <p>No.<br/>2. Plans for a Post-war World. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.</p> |
|---|--|

## Volume XV. \$6

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>No.<br/>1. Representative American Speeches: 1940-1941. A. C. Baird. \$1.25.<br/>2. Universal Military Service. R. E. Summers and H. B. Summers. \$1.25.<br/>3. Federal Regulation of Labor Unions. J. V. Garland. \$1.25.<br/>4. Federal Price Control. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.<br/>5. The "Eight Points" of Post-War World Reorganization. (Supplement to International Federation of Democracies. Vol. 14, No. 8) J. E. Johnsen. 90c.</p> | <p>No.<br/>6. Wages and Prices. R. E. Summers. \$1.25.<br/>7. The Closed Shop. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.<br/>8. Wartime Censorship of Press and Radio. R. E. Summers. \$1.25.<br/>9. Permanent Price Control Policy. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.<br/>10. A Federal Sales Tax. E. R. Nichols. \$1.25.</p> |
|--|--|

## Volume XIV. \$5.40

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>No.<br/>1. Representative American Speeches: 1939-1940. A. C. Baird. \$1.50.<br/>2. Interstate Trade Barriers. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.<br/>3. Increasing Federal Power. H. B. Summers and R. E. Summers. \$1.25.<br/>4. Planned Economy (Supplement to Increasing Federal Power) H. B. Summers and R. E. Summers. 90c.</p> | <p>No.<br/>6. Compulsory Military Training. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.<br/>7. The Monroe Doctrine and the Growth of Western Hemisphere Solidarity. R. K. Showman and L. S. Judson. \$1.25.<br/>8. International Federation of Democracies. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.<br/>9. Debate Index. Supplement. J. E. Johnsen. 75c.<br/>10. Federal Aid for Education. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.</p> |
|--|--|

## Volume XIII. \$6

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>No.<br/>1. Capital Punishment. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.<br/>2. The Railroad Problem. H. B. Summers and R. E. Summers. \$1.25.</p> | <p>No.<br/>3. Representative American Speeches: 1938-1939. A. C. Baird. \$1.25.<br/>4. Europe: Versailles to Warsaw. R. S. Kain. \$1.25.</p> |
|--|--|

0 0001 0337073 5

THE REF

## Volume XIII—Continued

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>No.</p> <p>5. Public Housing in America. M. B. Schnapper. \$1.25.</p> <p>6. United States Foreign Policy (Supplement) J. E. Johnsen. 75c.</p> <p>7. Student Congress Movement: with Discussion on American Neutrality. L. S. Judson. \$1.25.</p> | <p>No.</p> <p>8. The Railroads: Government Ownership in Practice (Supplement to The Railroad Problem) H. B. Summers and R. E. Summers. 75c.</p> <p>9. The National Labor Relations Act. Should It Be Amended? J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.</p> <p>10. Trade Unions and the Anti-Trust Laws. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.</p> |
|---|--|

## Volume XII. \$6

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>No.</p> <p>1. Anglo-American Agreement. H. B. Summers. \$1.25.</p> <p>2. Discussion Methods Explained and Illustrated. J. V. Garland and C. F. Phillips. (rev. ed. 1940) \$1.25.</p> <p>3. The State Sales Tax. E. R. Nichols and others. \$1.25.</p> <p>4. Dictatorships vs. Democracies. 1938 (Supplement to Anglo-American Agreements) H. B. Summers and R. E. Summers. 75c.</p> | <p>No.</p> <p>5. Pump-priming Theory of Government Spending. E. R. Nichols and William E. Roskam. \$1.25.</p> <p>6. United States Foreign Policy: Isolation or Alliance. J. E. Johnsen. \$1.25.</p> <p>7. Chain Stores and Legislation. Daniel Bloomfield. \$1.25.</p> <p>8. The United States and War. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>9. Debate Index. E. M. Phelps. 75c.</p> <p>10. Radio Censorship. H. B. Summers. \$1.25.</p> |
|--|---|

## Volume XI. \$6

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>No.</p> <p>1. Unicameral Legislatures. H. B. Summers.</p> <p>2. Consumers' Cooperatives. J. E. Johnsen, J. V. Garland, C. F. Phillips.</p> <p>3. Industrial versus Craft Unionism. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>4. Reorganization of the Supreme Court. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>5. Unicameralism in Practice: The Nebraska Legislative System. H. B. Summers.</p> | <p>No.</p> <p>6. Modern Group Discussion. L. and E. Judson.</p> <p>7. Arbitration and the National Labor Relations Board. E. R. Nichols and J. W. Logan.</p> <p>8. Peace and Rearmament. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>9. Chinese-Japanese War, 1937-. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>10. Representative American Speeches: 1937-1938. A. C. Baird. \$1.25.</p> |
|---|--|

## Volume X. \$4.20

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>No.</p> <p>1. Collective Bargaining. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>2. Lotteries. H. M. Muller.</p> <p>3. Old Age Pensions. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>5. Socialization of Medicine. J. E. Johnsen.</p> | <p>No.</p> <p>6. Limitation of Power of Supreme Court to Declare Acts of Congress Unconstitutional. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>9. Government Ownership of Electric Utilities. J. E. Johnsen.</p> <p>10. The Crisis in the Electric Utilities. Garland and Phillips.</p> |
|--|--|

940.9314 J65p (4)

## **Keep Your Card in This Pocket**

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



**Public Library**  
**Kansas City, Mo.**

## **Keep Your Card in This Pocket**

BERKOWITZ ENVELOPE CO., K. C., MO.

NOV 13 44

NOV 27 44

DEC 20 44

JAN 10 45

FEB 10 45

MAR 12 45

APR 23 45

12  
82





THE REFERENCE SHELF

---

Vol. 16

No. 2

# PLANS FOR A POST-WAR WORLD

Compiled by  
JULIA E. JOHNSEN



THE H. W. WILSON COMPANY  
NEW YORK

1942

Copyright 1942  
by The H. W. Wilson Company

*All Rights Reserved*

Published September 1942

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## PREFACE

In the midst of war men's thoughts have turned to peace. Perhaps never before, with the memory of a past peace failure before us, has it seemed so vitally necessary to plan wisely and soundly, and with timely forethought, for a new world order following the peace that is to come.

Among the many hopes voiced for postwar reconstruction three trends may be noted. There are the definite, concrete plans, political, social, economic, national or international, regional or world. Then there are trends of a growing internationalism spreading here and now, establishing patterns that may well evolve into more enduring channels marking the new order of the postwar world; representative of such are the working activities being carried out in every sphere, international cooperation and consultations, official and private reconstructive planning and research, policies of aid such as the lease-lend system, pledges of states, the entire efforts of the United Nations as such. Finally, but not least, there are being widely expressed today principles upon which a new order must be built, principles on which to base not only a peace that may endure but also a better world in which men and women may live.

The current number of the Reference Shelf follows two previous numbers of that series, *International Federation of Democracies (Proposed)*, and *The "Eight-Points" of Post-War World Reorganization*, published in April 1941 and March 1942 respectively. The materials here given are supplementary to those earlier publications, and for the most part are of recent date. Constructive thinking has, for the time being, largely superseded criticisms of special plans. Discussions have accordingly followed such current representative thought; at the same time the endeavor has been made to include an impartial and wide selection of authorities on postwar planning.

In addition to the bibliography, a list of organizations and agencies studying and working along the lines of international postwar reconstruction is included. The list of such organizations is a long and growing one. The attempt here is made to represent more particularly those agencies which are doing definite work in research, in propagation of plans, and in the issuing of literature, and whose activities are of more particular interest and value to the student and impartial inquirer.

The compiler makes grateful acknowledgement of copyright permissions and other courtesies.

Julia E. Johnsen

September 14, 1942

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE .....	3
DISCUSSION	
Wallace, Henry A. The Price of Free World Victory .....	7
Eichelberger, Clark M. When Peace Comes: a Challenge to America.....Contemporary Jewish Record	16
Hall, Manly P. As Democracy Awakens.....Horizon	26
Condon, E. U. A Physicists' Peace .....	34
Straight, Michael. Fight for the Future...Survey Graphic	37
Dean, Vera Micheles. Power and the Peacemakers..... .....Survey Graphic	39
Winning the Peace.....Christian Century	45
Hirsch, Joseph and Allen, Leonard. America Looks Beyond the War.....Southwestern Social Science Quarterly	50
Minsky, Louis. Religious Groups and the Post-War World .....Contemporary Jewish Record	58
Jinarajadasa, C. Theosophy and Reconstruction..... .....Theosophist	78
Toward World Government..... .....American Friends Service Committee	82
Comparison of Three Programs for Peace in the Post-War Reconstruction .....	86
Hudson, Manley O. International Courts in the Post-War World.....Annals of the American Academy	93
Thorndike, Lynn. Peace Aims: a Specific Proposal..... .....Political Science Quarterly	104
Staley, Eugene. Toward a Durable Peace...Common Sense	106
Huntington, Ellsworth. Map of the Future.....Time	112
The American Challenge.....Economist	115
Reconstruction .....	Engineer 120

	PAGE
Fleming, D. F. Coming World Order, Closed or Free .....Journal of Politics	124
Kaempffert, Waldemar. Reconstruction...New York Times	131
Labor Party's Plan To Win the Peace..... .....Bulletins from Britain	134
Reynolds, J. H. The War of Civilization Should Follow the War of Force ..... .....Association of American Colleges Bulletin	140
Huxley, Julian S. Job for American Higher Education .....New Republic	145
Laugier, Henry. A Weak Point in the Atlantic Charter .....Free World	150
Kingdon, Frank. Dangers of a False Peace...Free World	156
Howard, Harry Paxton. Wanted: a Pacific Charter..... .....Common Sense	163
Villard, Oswald Garrison. Should There Be a Long Armis- tice?.....Christian Century	167
Norton, John K. Keystone for the Peace Treaty..... .....Nation's Schools	169
Thomas, Norman. World Federation .....Call	172
Excerpts .....	176
ORGANIZATIONS .....	203
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
General References .....	213
The Atlantic Charter .....	226
The Democracies and the United Nations .....	227
Regional Problems .....	230
Africa, 230; Asia and the Pacific, 230; Pan Amer- ica, 231; Reconstruction in Europe, 232	
Religious Statements on Reconstruction and Peace .....	234
Economic Problems .....	236

## DISCUSSION

### THE PRICE OF FREE WORLD VICTORY<sup>1</sup>

We, who in a formal or an informal way represent most of the free peoples of the world, are met here tonight in the interests of the millions in all the nations who have freedom in their souls. To my mind this meeting has just one purpose—to let those millions in other countries know that here in the United States are 130 million men, women, and children who are in this war to the finish. Our American people are utterly resolved to go on until they can strike the relentless blows that will assure a complete victory, and with it win a new day for the lovers of freedom, everywhere on this earth.

This is a fight between a slave world and a free world. Just as the United States in 1862 could not remain half slave and half free, so in 1942 the world must make its decision for a complete victory one way or the other.

As we begin the final stages of this fight to the death between the free world and the slave world, it is worth while to refresh our minds about the march of freedom for the common man. The idea of freedom—the freedom that we in the United States know and love so well—is derived from the Bible with its extraordinary emphasis on the dignity of the individual. Democracy is the only true political expression of Christianity.

The prophets of the Old Testament were the first to preach social justice. But that which was sensed by the prophets many centuries before Christ was not given complete and powerful political expression until our nation was formed as a Federal Union a century and a half ago. Even then, the march of the common people had just begun. Most of them did not yet know

<sup>1</sup> By Henry A. Wallace, Vice President of the United States. Address before the Free World Association, New York City, May 8, 1942. The Author. Washington, D. C.



how to read and write. There were no public schools to which all children could go. Men and women cannot be really free until they have plenty to eat, and time and ability to read and think and talk things over. Down the years, the people of the United States have moved steadily forward in the practice of democracy. Through universal education, they now can read and write and form opinions of their own. They have learned, and are still learning, the art of production—that is, how to make a living. They have learned, and are still learning, the art of self-government.

If we were to measure freedom by standards of nutrition, education, and self-government, we might rank the United States and certain nations of western Europe very high. But this would not be fair to other nations where education has become widespread only in the last 20 years. In many nations, a generation ago, nine out of ten of the people could not read or write. Russia, for example, was changed from an illiterate to a literate nation within one generation and, in the process, Russia's appreciation of freedom was enormously enhanced. In China, the increase during the past 30 years in the ability of the people to read and write has been matched by their increased interest in real liberty.

Everywhere, reading and writing are accompanied by industrial progress, and industrial progress sooner or later inevitably brings a strong labor movement. From a long-time and fundamental point of view, there are no backward peoples which are lacking in mechanical sense. Russians, Chinese, and the Indians both of India and the Americas all learn to read and write and operate machines just as well as your children and my children. Everywhere the common people are on the march. Thousands of them are learning to read and write, learning to think together, learning to use tools. These people are learning to think and work together in labor movements, some of which may be extreme or impractical at first, but which eventually will settle down to serve effectively the interests of the common man.

When the freedom-loving people march—when the farmers have an opportunity to buy land at reasonable prices and to sell the produce of their land through their own organizations, when workers have the opportunity to form unions and bargain through them collectively, and when the children of all the people have an opportunity to attend schools which teach them the truths of the real world in which they live—when these opportunities are open to everyone, then the world moves straight ahead.

But in countries where the ability to read and write has been recently acquired or where the people have had no long experience in governing themselves on the basis of their own thinking, it is easy for demagogues to arise and prostitute the mind of the common man to their own base ends. Such a demagogue may get financial help from some person of wealth who is unaware of what the end result will be. With this backing, the demagogue may dominate the minds of the people, and, from whatever degree of freedom they have, lead them backward into slavery. Herr Thyssen, the wealthy German steel man, little realized what he was doing when he gave Hitler enough money to enable him to play on the minds of the German people. The demagogue is the curse of the modern world, and, of all the demagogues, the worst are those financed by well-meaning wealthy men who sincerely believe that their wealth is likely to be safer if they can hire men with political "it" to change the sign posts and lure the people back into slavery of the most degraded kind. Unfortunately for the wealthy men who finance movements of this sort, as well as for the people themselves, the successful demagogue is a powerful genie who, when once let out of his bottle, refuses to obey anyone's command. As long as his spell holds, he defies God Himself, and Satan is turned loose upon the world.

Through the leaders of the Nazi revolution, Satan now is trying to lead the common man of the whole world back into slavery and darkness. For the stark truth is that the violence preached by the Nazis is the devil's own religion of darkness.

So also is the doctrine that one race or one class is by heredity superior and that all other races or classes are supposed to be slaves. The belief in one Satan-inspired Fuehrer, with his Quislings, his Laval, and his Mussolinis—his "gauleiters" in every nation in the world—is the last and ultimate darkness. Is there any hell hotter than that of being a Quisling, unless it is that of being a Laval or a Mussolini?

In a twisted sense, there is something almost great in the figure of the Supreme Devil operating through a human form, in a Hitler who has the daring to spit straight into the eye of God and man. But the Nazi system has a heroic position for only one leader. By definition only one person is allowed to retain full sovereignty over his own soul. All the rest are stooges—they are stooges who have been mentally and politically degraded, and who feel that they can get square with the world only by mentally and politically degrading other people. These stooges are really psychopathic cases. Satan has turned loose upon us the insane.

The march of freedom of the past 150 years has been a long-drawn-out people's revolution. In this Great Revolution of the people, there were the American Revolution of 1775, the French Revolution of 1792, the Latin-American revolutions of the Bolivar era, the German Revolution of 1848, and the Russian Revolution of 1918. Each spoke for the common man in terms of blood on the battlefield. Some went to excess. But the significant thing is that the people groped their way to the light. More of them learned to think and work together.

The people's revolution aims at peace and not at violence, but if the rights of the common man are attacked, it unleashes the ferocity of a she-bear who has lost a cub. When the Nazi psychologists tell their master Hitler that we in the United States may be able to produce hundreds of thousands of planes, but that we have no will to fight, they are only fooling themselves and him. The truth is that when the rights of the American people are transgressed, as those rights have been transgressed, the American people will fight with a relentless fury which will

drive the ancient Teutonic gods back cowering into their caves. The Götterdämmerung has come for Odin and his crew.

The people are on the march toward even fuller freedom than the most fortunate peoples of the earth have hitherto enjoyed. No Nazi counterrevolution will stop it. The common man will smoke the Hitler stooges out into the open in the United States, in Latin America, and in India. He will destroy their influence. No Lavals, no Mussolinis will be tolerated in a Free World.

The people, in their millennial and revolutionary march toward manifesting here on earth the dignity that is in every human soul, hold as their credo the Four Freedoms enunciated by President Roosevelt in his message to Congress on January 6, 1941. These Four Freedoms are the very core of the revolution for which the United Nations have taken their stand. We who live in the United States may think there is nothing very revolutionary about freedom of religion, freedom of expression, and freedom from the fear of secret police. But when we begin to think about the significance of freedom from want for the average man, then we know that the revolution of the past 150 years has not been completed, either here in the United States or in any other nation in the world. We know that this revolution cannot stop until freedom from want has actually been attained.

And now, as we move forward toward realizing the Four Freedoms of this people's revolution, I would like to speak about four duties. It is my belief that every freedom, every right, every privilege has its price, its corresponding duty without which it cannot be enjoyed. The four duties of the people's revolution, as I see them today, are these:

1. The duty to produce to the limit.
2. The duty to transport as rapidly as possible to the field of battle.
3. The duty to fight with all that is in us.
4. The duty to build a peace—just, charitable, and enduring.

The fourth duty is that which inspires the other three.

We failed in our job after World War I. We did not know how to go about it to build an enduring world-wide peace. We did not have the nerve to follow through and prevent Germany from rearming. We did not insist that she "learn war no more." We did not build a peace treaty on the fundamental doctrine of the people's revolution. We did not strive wholeheartedly to create a world where there could be freedom from want for all the peoples. But by our very errors we learned much, and after this war we shall be in position to utilize our knowledge in building a world which is economically, politically, and, I hope, spiritually sound.

Modern science, which is a by-product and an essential part of the people's revolution, has made it technologically possible to see that all of the people of the world get enough to eat. Half in fun and half seriously, I said the other day to Madame Litvinoff: "The object of this war is to make sure that everybody in the world has the privilege of drinking a quart of milk a day." She replied: "Yes, even half a pint." The peace must mean a better standard of living for the common man, not merely in the United States and England but also in India, Russia, China, and Latin America—not merely in the United Nations but also in Germany and Italy and Japan.

Some have spoken of the "American Century." I say that the century on which we are entering—the century which will come out of this war—can be read and must be the century of the common man. Perhaps it will be America's opportunity to suggest the freedoms and duties by which the common man must live. Everywhere the common man must learn to build his own industries with his own hands in a practical fashion. Everywhere the common man must learn to increase his productivity so that he and his children can eventually pay to the world community all that they have received. No nation will have the God-given right to exploit other nations. Older nations will have the privilege to help younger nations get started on the

path to industrialization, but there must be neither military nor economic imperialism. The methods of the nineteenth century will not work in the people's century which is now about to begin. India, China, and Latin America have a tremendous stake in the people's century. As their masses learn to read and write, and as they become productive mechanics, their standard of living will double and treble. Modern science, when devoted wholeheartedly to the general welfare, has in it potentialities of which we do not yet dream.

And modern science must be released from German slavery. International cartels that serve American greed and the German will to power must go. Cartels in the peace to come must be subjected to international control for the common man, as well as being under adequate control by the respective home governments. In this way, we can prevent the Germans from again building a war machine while we sleep. With international monopoly pools under control, it will be possible for inventions to serve all the people instead of only the few.

Yes, and when the time of peace comes, the citizen will again have a duty, the supreme duty of sacrificing the lesser interests for the greater interest of the general welfare. Those who write the peace must think of the whole world. There can be no privileged peoples. We ourselves in the United States are no more a master race than the Nazis. And we cannot perpetuate economic warfare without planting the seeds of military warfare. We must use our power at the peace table to build an economic peace that is just, charitable, and enduring.

If we really believe that we are fighting for a people's peace, all the rest becomes easy. Production, yes—it will be easy to get production without either strikes or sabotage; production with the wholehearted cooperation between willing arms and keen brains; enthusiasm, zip, energy geared to the tempo of keeping at it everlastingly day after day. Hitler knows as well as those of us who sit in on the War Production Board meetings that we here in the United States are winning the battle of pro-

duction. He knows that both labor and business in the United States are doing a most remarkable job and that his only hope is to crash through to a complete victory some time during the next six months.

And then there is the task of transportation to the line of battle by truck, by railroad car, by ship. We shall joyously deny ourselves so that our transportation system is improved by at least 30 per cent.

I need say little about the duty to fight. Some people declare, and Hitler believes, that the American people have grown soft in the last generation. Hitler agents continually preach in South America that we are cowards, unable to use, like the "brave" German soldiers, the weapons of modern war. It is true that American youth hates war with a holy hatred. But because of that fact and because Hitler and the German people stand as the very symbol of war, we shall fight with a tireless enthusiasm until war and the possibility of war have been removed from this planet. We shall cleanse the plague spot of Europe, which is Hitler's Germany, and with it the hell-hole of Asia—Japan.

The American people have always had guts and always will have. You know the story of Bomber Pilot Dixon and Radioman Gene Aldrich and Ordnanceman Tony Pastula—the story which Americans will be telling their children for generations to illustrate man's ability to master any fate. These men lived for 34 days on the open sea in a rubber life raft, 8 feet by 4 feet, with no food but that which they took from the sea and the air with one pocket knife and a pistol. And yet they lived it through and came at last to the beach of an island they did not know. In spite of their suffering and weakness, they stood like men, with no weapon left to protect themselves, and no shoes on their feet or clothes on their backs, and walked in military file because, they said, "if there were Japs, we didn't want to be crawling."

The American fighting men, and all the fighting men of the United Nations, will need to summon all their courage during the next few months. I am convinced that the summer and fall

of 1942 will be a time of supreme crisis for us all. Hitler, like the prize fighter who realizes he is on the verge of being knocked out, is gathering all his remaining forces for one last desperate blow. There is abject fear in the heart of the madman and a growing discontent among his people as he prepares for his last all-out offensive.

We may be sure that Hitler and Japan will cooperate to do the unexpected—perhaps an attack by Japan against Alaska and our Northwest coast at a time when German transport planes will be shuttled across from Dakar to furnish leadership and stiffening to a German uprising in Latin America. In any event, the psychological and sabotage offensive in the United States and Latin America will be timed to coincide with, or anticipate by a few weeks, the height of the military offensive.

We must be especially prepared to stifle the fifth columnists in the United States who will try to sabotage not merely our war material plants but, even more important, our minds. We must be prepared for the worst kind of fifth-column work in Latin America, much of it operating through the agency of governments with which the United States at present is at peace. When I say this, I recognize that the peoples, both of Latin America and of the nations supporting the agencies through which the fifth columnists work, are overwhelmingly on the side of the democracies. We must expect the offensive against us on the military, propaganda, and sabotage fronts, both in the United States and in Latin America, to reach its apex some time during the next few months. The convulsive efforts of the dying madman will be so great that some of us may be deceived into thinking that the situation is bad at a time when it is really getting better. But in the case of most of us, the events of the next few months, disturbing though they may be, will only increase our will to bring about complete victory in this war of liberation. Prepared in spirit, we cannot be surprised. Psychological terrorism will fall flat. As we nerve ourselves for the supreme effort in this hemisphere we must not forget the sub-



lime heroism of the oppressed in Europe and Asia, whether it be in the mountains of Yugoslavia, the factories of Czechoslovakia and France, the farms of Poland, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium, among the seamen of Norway, or in the occupied areas of China and the Dutch East Indies. Everywhere the soul of man is letting the tyrant know that slavery of the body does not end resistance.

There can be no half measures. North, South, East, West, and Middle West—the will of the American people is for complete victory.

No compromise with Satan is possible. We shall not rest until all the victims under the Nazi yoke are freed. We shall fight for a complete peace as well as a complete victory.

The people's revolution is on the march, and the devil and all his angels cannot prevail against it. They cannot prevail, for on the side of the people is the Lord.

He giveth power to the faint; to them that have no might He increaseth strength. . . . They that wait upon the Lord shall . . . mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.

Strong in the strength of the Lord, we who fight in the people's cause will never stop until that cause is won.

## WHEN PEACE COMES: A CHALLENGE TO AMERICA <sup>2</sup>

The entrance of the United States into the war will have a profound effect upon postwar settlements. The degree of this effect, however, will depend to a considerable extent upon the determination and imagination of the American Government and upon the thoroughness with which the American people realize that winning the war and winning the peace are parts of

<sup>2</sup> By Clark M. Eichelberger, Director of the League of Nations Association and of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. *Contemporary Jewish Record*, 5:123-30. April, 1942.

the same fundamental problem—the substitution of law and civilization in place of anarchy and brutality. American sacrifices must not end with the war; they must be carried into the organization of peace.

One effect is quite obvious—the full military weight of the United States on the side of the Allies means overwhelming victory. Before the entrance of the United States, there were two great dangers in the way of the final organization of peace. The first was to be found in the possibility that the war might end in a stalemate. Without the added weight of the military might of the United States there would have been great doubt as to the ability of the Allies to win a complete victory. Peace based upon a stalemate could have been nothing more than an armed truce, with military preparedness and fear gradually consuming the moral and economic life of the people, with another war or revolution as the climax.

The other danger lay in the possibility of fatigue. Even if the Allies could have held on long enough to win a complete victory through a combination of military might and German internal collapse, they might have been too tired at the conclusion of their victory to make a strong peace and then guarantee it. Even with military victory, without a strong peace with absolute guarantees of political security and without economic opportunity, the result in this case might have been a condition of international anarchy, with revolution or resumption of war as the end.

No American doubts that this country is fully determined to fight on until the Axis Powers are completely defeated. Despite the serious defeat at Pearl Harbor which compelled the entrance of the United States into the war, the Allies, the defeated peoples who pray for deliverance, and even neutrals themselves have taken on new hope and determination because of American entrance. With an all-out effort on the part of the United States, victory should come soon enough to leave sufficient energy among the peoples and governments of the

United Nations to make a strong peace and enforce it. Victory will mean clearing the world of the Nazi leaders in order that the nations can proceed to build the structure of a new order of international society. Unfortunately it is not absolutely certain that the nations will take advantage of their victory to build a durable peace with an international organization strong enough to prevent aggression and wise enough to remove the causes of war. A shortsighted desire for economic gain and a limited horizon of isolationism may repeat the tragedy of 1919.

But the opportunity will be there, and furthermore there is encouraging evidence that the people have learned from the experience of the last twenty years and will not permit the fruits of victory to be snatched from them in a postwar period of anarchy and selfishness. Resoluteness and imagination on the part of governments, spurred on by a determined people willing to sacrifice petty considerations for larger gains, can organize the results of victory into permanent fruits of peace.

Already there is evidence of the resoluteness and imagination of the governments to be found in the Atlantic Charter, the formation of the United Nations, the apparent determination to carry these institutions over into the peace, the extension of the Atlantic Charter in reality to the Far East and Latin America, and the economic pact with Great Britain. While the Atlantic Charter was drawn before the United States was a belligerent, it should be considered with the others as important steps in war and peace strategy. Most encouraging evidence can be sighted also in a determination of the people to see the job through. Anyone who has not faced American audiences in the past few weeks would be astonished at the thoughtfulness with which all sections of the population—labor, business, students, etc.—are looking to the long future.

The first World War showed the historic cycle of war, armistice and peace conference, and was followed by the establishment of international machinery. Only in the later days of the first war did governments put forward anything into which

the people could get their teeth as looking toward the future peace. The Allied and Associated Powers were not organized during the war into an organization which was so definitely intended to carry over.

This orthodox pattern is not developing in the present conflict. There will be victory, with possibly an armistice to signalize the cessation of hostilities, but already, while the unprepared Allies are still on the defensive and suffering tragic defeats, they have had both the imagination and the foresight to outline the general terms of permanent postwar settlement. The organization of the Allies has been given a more permanent name, "United Nations," and the predication of their agreements upon the Atlantic Charter binds them to join action after the cessation of hostilities.

A comparison of the Atlantic Charter with the Wilsonian Fourteen Points discloses that the Fourteen Points, coming later in the war, outlined more specifically the terms of political settlement. They projected the League of Nations, whereas the Atlantic Charter goes no further than to lay down general principles for the restoration of independence and self-government. The necessity of international organization is implied rather than outlined in the seventh and eighth points of the Charter. But in comparison the Charter has much to say about better economic relations, freedom of trade and distribution of raw materials with a vision that "all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want." If properly implemented, it contains the hope for a new order of international society whose settlements will go beyond political and juridical agreements into the broad realm of economic and social justice. It must be repeated that it took courage and foresight to project such an agreement when Allied arms were on the defensive in every corner of the globe.

The "Declaration by United Nations" is an agreement among twenty-six belligerent powers opposing the Axis aggressors to use their full strength in cooperation until victory is secured and

not to make a separate peace. It may be something more. Indeed, its framers undoubtedly intended it so. Based as the agreement is upon the Atlantic Charter, the conclusion is inescapable that the United Nations are obligated to continue their cooperation to achieve the promises of the Charter. The United Nations should continue through the period of transition and reconstruction following the cessation of hostilities and become the nucleus of the permanent organization of international society.

The economic pact with Great Britain which was signed on the 23rd of February of this year between Sumner Wells, Acting Secretary of State, and Viscount Halifax, the British Ambassador, places the settlement for the transfer of lend-lease material in the broad scope of international economic collaboration. I quote from Article 7:

In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the United Kingdom in return for aid furnished under the Act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations. To that end, they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the United Kingdom, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the Joint Declaration made on August 12, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom.

The entrance of the United States into the conflict has extended the influence of the Atlantic Charter and the ideals of the Government of the United States to Latin America. The important visit of Mr. Welles to the conference at Rio de Janeiro concluded a series of agreements of far-reaching effect.

With only two exceptions, all of the Pan American nations have broken off diplomatic relations and suspended economic relations with the Axis Powers, becoming in a sense non-belligerent allies. The whole scope of the Rio agreements looks to the rise of living and labor standards, to the stabilization of economic life, to the reduction of trade barriers and to the establishment of a goal of economic and social justice within and among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics place themselves within the orbit of the Atlantic Charter by taking note of its contents and expressing "to the President of the United States of America . . . satisfaction with the inclusion in that document of principles which constitute a part of the juridical heritage of America in accordance with the Convention on Rights and Duties of States approved at the Seventh International Conference of American States, held at Montevideo in 1933."

Another evidence of long-range planning on the part of government, labor and employer, in which the United States contributed its influence, is to be found in the resolution introduced by the American delegation to the International Labor Conference in New York in November, 1941. The resolution requested the Governing Body:

(a) . . . To call to their [governments of the Member States] attention the desirability of associating the International Labor Organization with the planning and application of measures of reconstruction, and to ask that the International Labor Organization be represented in any Peace or Reconstruction Conference following the war;

(b) to suggest to the governments of the Member States that they should, if they have not already done so, set up representative agencies for the study of the social and economic needs of the postwar world and that such agencies should consult with the appropriate organs of the International Labor Organization;

(c) to set up from its own membership a small tripartite committee, instructed to study and prepare (i) measures of reconstruction and (ii) emergency measures to deal with unemployment, which should be empowered to enlist the assistance of technically qualified experts and authorized to cooperate with governmental, intergovernmental and

private agencies engaged in similar studies and with those agencies whose present activities in the social and economic field affect the conditions under which postwar programs will be carried out. . . .

The staff of the International Labor Office at Montreal is already moving to carry out this resolution.

The entrance of the United States into the war has assisted in carrying the promise of the Atlantic Charter to the Far East. At the time of its announcement, many people thoughtlessly considered that the Charter applied especially to the Western world. Its promise of economic and social justice and political liberty was considered primarily the rights and privileges of the West. Despite the heroic resistance of the Chinese to Japanese aggression, the war in the Pacific and the war in the Atlantic had not been unified.

The spread of the theater of war to the Middle East and the entrance of Russia brought the two wars very near to each other, but it was the attack upon Pearl Harbor which finally forced all statesmen to realize that Japan was a full-fledged Axis partner and had agreed to participate in the assault upon civilization. The disastrous defeats at Singapore, Malaya and Burma indicated that the native peoples had not been made to feel that their participation in the war or the benefits to come was wanted with the result that in some cases they regarded themselves as spectators in the conflict. This fact together with the dramatic visit of Chiang Kai-shek to India, urging India to participate more vigorously in the war and the British to give India greater political liberty, brought the application of the Atlantic Charter nearer to Asia. The British Cabinet crisis and the entrance of Sir Stafford Cripps coupled with President Roosevelt's address of February 23 add to the hope that the promises of justice in the Atlantic Charter exist for the teeming millions of Asia who comprise over half the population of the world.

In his address of February 23, President Roosevelt stated: "We of the United Nations are agreed on certain broad principles in the kind of peace we seek. The Atlantic Charter applies not only to the parts of the world that border the Atlantic but to the whole world; disarmament of aggressors, self-determination of nations and peoples, and the four freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear."

No one will doubt but that the entrance of the United States into the war has added to the confidence of hundreds of millions of courageous human beings that the United Nations will win the war. Despite the tragic beginning at Pearl Harbor, this entrance has even given fresh hope to millions of conquered people and certainly has not improved German and Italian morale. It has speeded up the implementation of the Atlantic Charter, led to the creation of the United Nations, extended the general benefits of these agreements to Latin America and acted as a moral impetus for the extension of these principles to the Far East.

Will the United States see it through? The greatest drawback to American influence has been the haunting fear that the American people and their government may capriciously turn their backs upon their friends and the problems of the world and seek solace in isolation. The memory of 1919-1941 is still very fresh. There are statesmen languishing in concentration camps, and there are millions of disillusioned human beings at war who believe that had the United States not repudiated Woodrow Wilson in 1919 the world might be a different place today.

On my recent visit to Great Britain a number of people said to me that they knew that they could not run away from the peace, but they were afraid that the United States might try to do so, and consequently their planning for the future would go just as far as they thought the American Government and people would carry through. My most unexpected discovery in



Great Britain was the way in which the masses of the people anticipate a better Britain and a better world to come and the way in which most classes, including the wealthy, are willing to give up an uncertain world of class and large fortunes for a world of peace, security and justice. If in some sections of Britain, including the government, there are those who seem to be delaying the discussion of how this idealism may be translated into practical agreements with the United States, the blame cannot be put simply upon any Toryism, but upon the feeling, justified by twenty years of bitter history, that the United States Government and the American people may not carry through.

Most Americans would deny that there is any present basis for such uncertainty. Isolation to them has finally passed. The stab in the back at Pearl Harbor shattered conceit, myths of invulnerability and the illusion of isolation. To most Americans the only possible path to follow is the hard but clearly indicated road, constant international cooperation. The people are commencing to see that the strategy of war and the strategy of peace are parts of the same problem.

Of course no one nation could or should be solely the determining power in the organization of peace to follow victory. All of the twenty-six United Nations and some of the free peoples in exile from countries not members of the United Nations will make their contribution to the total defeat of the Axis and the organization of peace. No one would doubt that Britain will be in a very important position in the future—probably less of an empire but an even greater commonwealth of free peoples. Russia and China will emerge as more powerful factors than many would have predicted twelve months ago. But without minimizing the importance or contribution of others, it can be said that the power of the United States, if vigorously and courageously used, can be a decisive and determining factor in the future peace. The very entrance of

the United States contributes to total victory, which is the very prerequisite to a stable peace.

Certain attributes of the American people may be an important contribution to the world of the future. In the United States more than in possibly any other country the achievements of modern science applied to industry have resulted in the distribution of the greatest benefits to the greatest number of people. The problems of the postwar world will more than anything else be the problem of seeing to it that the technical achievements of modern industry give social and economic justice to all the people in all the lands.

Such a development will require a considerable amount of international organization with machinery in the economic and social fields. There again the American people, despite their refusal to participate fully in the international machinery of the last twenty years have much to contribute. A hundred and thirty million Americans united in one democratic system comprise one of the largest number of free people under one flag. Part of their prosperity is due to the large free trade area which they enjoy. And in conclusion, they have demonstrated a practical idealism and humanitarianism which have given confidence to the whole world and made the United States an inspiration to oppressed people throughout the world.

Now that the American people are no longer content to let others do their fighting for them but have thrown their full weight on the side of victory, all of these attributes may contribute much to the development of future international society, providing that the American people have the patience, the courage, and the wisdom to cooperate with others in the building of this international society. Never has a choice involved so much. A retreat into isolation means further chaos and the end of our Western civilization, but cooperation will mean the beginning of a new era in international life.

AS DEMOCRACY AWAKENS<sup>3</sup>

We have just as many ambitious people in America as in Europe. Why should Europe be so much more ambitious from a military standpoint?—as we find it difficult to reconcile to keeping even a small peacetime standing army? One of the reasons is our tradition. Another reason is, nearly all of Europe is cramped in perspective. Europe lacks outlets. An area of land not much larger than the western half of the United States has been divided into thirty nations, many of them small, with a population problem which has been intense; they are nations isolated by boundaries and frontiers, religions, and customs; many are nations which have no outlets except through other nations. These are peoples who have fought for centuries not against lesser opponents, but against being absorbed by greater neighbors; peoples constantly maintaining little individual existences, keeping their ranks, keeping their traditions, cultures, and beliefs, and so remaining each of them apart, intermarrying in their own small tribes, maintaining their traditions, and lore, and art, and music, and industry at a tremendous personal sacrifice. This has resulted in strong nationalistic feelings, strong family ties, but most of all it made Europe very provincial. How could it be otherwise, with a mass of small peoples struggling to be themselves against any general forward current toward internationalism.

With the exception of a few isolated cases there is no internationalism in Europe, regardless of what we may hope in that direction. Altogether, in one way or another, these nations have committed the unforgivable sin of being provincial. For, it does not make any difference whether it be a narrow minded nation, or a narrow minded individual, both come to grief. There is no virtue in isolation, so far as mental procedure is

<sup>3</sup> By Manly Palmer Hall, Philosopher and Author. *Horizon*. 1:1-8. July, 1942.

concerned. That does not suggest that we should necessarily go out and insist on mingling ourselves in other people's concerns; but the mental isolation of thinking our own thoughts, whether the rest of the world approves or not, does not pay any dividends at all. In these crystallized communities, well larded with hates, prejudices, and suspicions, the disease of imperialistic ambition has seemingly found a particularly fertile ground for development.

Then, of course, European consciousness has a greater veneration for authority than we have. Europe produces despots and tyrants because Europe venerates them. In this country, let someone get up and start acting like a Dictator, and everyone starts to laugh; which of course, sort of spoils things. But in Europe, no one laughs; they take Mr. Loudspeaker at face value; if he says he is a Dictator, he is. They have never run their own affairs, and never hope to. The best they hope is that the next dictator will be a little less of a tyrant than the last one.

The nearest thing we have is the politician, but he has to get along with American refusal of any profound veneration for the individual who is a sublime egotist. We do not have dictators here as in Europe because *we* are all egotists!—we say to ourselves, let him play dictator if he wants to; okay; he thinks he is good. *I know* I am good. The game is not played here according to European rules; we do not take it seriously, and there is no pleasure in it.

The dictator to us is a scourge; he is immeasurably destructive of property, of human-kind. He kills; corpses pile up in his wake and train. His methods are those of a horrible insanity. As we look upon the toll of death today we think of it of course as a sort of climax of the ages. Never was there anything so bad as this; never will there be anything as bad again. That is due to lack of perspective. In the Dark Ages, history tells us, one epidemic of the bubonic plague killed three-quarters of the population of the earth. We do not realize that this happened within the last five hundred years. How many people

reading history have found out that three-quarters of the population of the earth died of plague alone? We do not realize those things, because our miseries of today are supreme. We do not realize the world has always been passing through crises, that the great bubonic plague was one thing the gods could send to clean off the surface of the earth—not that it did a perfect job, by a long way; but it did bring man's mind forcibly to the necessity of sanitation. Three or four hundred millions of people had to die from the plague alone to remind human beings that it was necessary to depart from the old Florentine custom of throwing the garbage under the beds.

Now, it may take the lives of three or four hundred million people again before human beings will find out it is not necessary to settle war in the way we do it. There is no need for war. Everything man does can be arbitrated. A billion persons may have to die before we will accept that fact. And that is not because the Universe is unkind; it is because human beings are inconceivably stupid when it comes to learning things that are good for them. Good habits are painfully acquired, as we may well realize in our chaos of today created out of ambitions and counter-ambitions.

Not many months ago it looked as though a great way of life was going to come to an end; it looked as though, as far as man was concerned, democracy was just about done for. It was boasted in Europe that the whole theory of the rights of the people was absolutely exploded. Why? Well, a European dictator had a very good answer for that. He said—and this is almost paraphrasing Adolph Hitler—the reason why democracy was failing was because democratic people were incapable of administering it unselfishly. In other words, democracies were used as an opportunity to exploit rather than to cooperate. Thus the democratic nations were going nowhere.

And that criticism was not entirely unfounded. All democratic nations had interpreted democracy as the right to exploit under the law. It protected us so we could not be prevented

from the free and unassailable right to exploit others up to a certain point—and there has always been a question just where that point was, where freedom left off, say, and crime began. One of our most famous gangsters, after murdering half a dozen other gangsters, took refuge in the fact this was a free country; to him that meant he ought to be able to do what he wanted to do. He was very hurt when he found freedom did not include murder. This condition exists in some democratic states, not necessarily to the degree of gangsterism of course, but to the degree where the majority of the population is using democracy as a basis for personal advantage and exploitation, rather than the basis of a common fraternity of growth and development. We have not been specially aware of our responsibility to the state; only aware of the state's responsibility to us. At the moment when law interfered with our ambitions we wanted to reject it; when it served our ends we wanted to hide behind it. So, more or less lax, and through success and its attendant evils, we were slipping very comfortably into a position of decadence; and had this decadence become general, there is no question but that democracy would have died. It was dying fast.

If there is much more democracy in the world today than there was a few years ago, it is because more people vitally and actually believe in freedom and the rights of man, and are willing to make the supreme sacrifice for it. There are ten ready today where there was one two years ago, because of the simple fact we have become aware of that which we were in danger of losing. The principle of democracy is now safe for another twenty-five years at least; it is safe until we get prosperous and secure again. From a democratic standpoint we are safer than we have been since the World War I. Not only has the march of totalitarianism failed to stamp out democratic forms of government, it has not put under in any way the democratic philosophy of life. In those countries which have been subjugated, and those countries that have been brought

into line with totalitarian thought, there is more democracy than ever before. Today, in exile and afflicted as it is, there is more democracy in France than there was before the war, there is more spirit in France for the democracy that is ultimately assured by the realization that is coming over its people—a realization, had it come five years sooner, that would have prevented a war in Europe. This is true of every country Germany has taken over. The very effort that has been made to destroy democracy is the one thing that is probably going to save it. We were careless of it, indifferent to it; we had grown used to the idea of freedom; we did not realize that everything in nature man desires and needs he must eternally protect to keep; there is no reward for carelessness and thoughtlessness.

Many people are wondering how the effects of this war are going to be measured in the democratic nations, particularly the two that are dominant in this war pattern; that is, Great Britain and the United States. There has been a great question, how democratic really is Great Britain? I think that is a fair question. England, of course, established the precedent in Western Europe for what we call the democratic pattern. The Magna Charta was the first declaration of modern democracy. The intrinsic democracy of England thus has had a good case, but I do not think England has been democratic in the sense we understand the term. Among the European nations England was probably outstandingly democratic, but in comparison to the United States very tradition bound, very aristocracy conscious; and so not essentially democratic internally and in relationship to the rest of the world. But the England of today is not the England that went into the war. England is a hundred times more democratic. A strong alliance of principles is emerging from this whole war pattern, with the possibilities of destroying England by military means becoming less every minute—because the British people are now becoming strongly democratic. . . .

Out of the things we are doing now, is that [democratic civilization] going to come? I am inclined to think that some

new types of international patterns are in the offing. I think when this war is over the world will be so tired of autocracy we shall be able to go at least twenty-five years without a new epidemic of it. By that time we will have a new generation that will not be tired of anything. Europe is seeing in the sacrifices of this great struggle the need for more emphasis on democratic rights and privileges. The motion of civilization forward demands democracy, but how long would it have taken to achieve democracy according to the way the world was moving from 1920 to 1930, or from 1930 to 1938? The way we were moving in that period of nearly two decades we would not have been any further along a thousand years from now. We were concerned only with ourselves and small personal things. We had no particular patriotism toward anything. We were disillusioned with our leaders, tired of everything, bored to distraction. The financial situation was the only thing that really perturbed us. Now how long would we have to go on like that to be parents of the New Age? We would have had to go on indefinitely, and then never be anywhere. We were all trying in one way or another to exploit each other rather than serve each other. We were selfish in the extreme, self-centered, inconsistent, and unkind.

Is it such a terrible thing to have world war force us into destructive patterns? What about the destruction that went on when there was no war? We were not actually taking men out and shooting them, but we were wearing and grinding them to pieces through unkindness, cruelty, and indifference. We were denying them opportunity for employment; in the field of economics, industry and politics we were actually slaughtering mankind by the millions, for we were killing everything within men that made life worth living. The American way was to do anything that was profitable; nothing otherwise. Democracy would surely have died, had something not come along by which our own fallacies precipitated us into the condition we are in—military war. By death from guns and bombs suddenly we



began to realize how vital soul things are. War is a crude way of learning a lesson, but man is cruel. A French statesman said, many years ago, the only thing worse than the cruelty of war is the cruelty of peace. Man without a high purpose finds a thousand unworthy things to do. So periodically we fill up the container. We precipitate crises; and then we have to survive them. Nature has but one purpose, and that is, the accomplishment of ultimates. If we will not accomplish in one way we shall be forced to accomplish in another. That is the reason for this war, all wars.

Some day we should all study the philosophy of democracy. What it meant as a religious philosophy. How it came into existence. What it implies in the life of the individual. Then we will have a weapon with which we can approach any problem. All policy is ultimately a political philosophy. The purpose of the philosophy of life is to explain the reason of things as they are, and to live in harmony with those reasons. If we can arise from the emergency of this time to a clear statement of democratic principles so that we can live them, we can assure the world a better sphere of philosophic purpose.

To improve most rapidly we must have as much freedom as is possible. Individual thought is destroyed by regimentation; it destroys individual responsibility, and to destroy individual responsibility is to prevent man from developing the most important faculty of his mind, the faculty of thinking for himself. When the community thinks for the individual, he grows weaker. As he becomes an exact machine he ceases to use his own mental faculties, ceases to be a human being. Where the right of free thought does not exist, philosophy is all distorted, deformed by the very environment that produced it. Such is the case with the Marxian philosophy, which was deformed by environment, and therefore is incapable of leading mankind to any ultimate. A philosophy to be sufficient must arise from one of two conditions. Either from an environment appropriate to it, or from an individual greater than his environment. There have been a

few individuals in history who so transcended their own environment that they created their own. But, more commonly, philosophy emerges through peoples as the result of national conditions.

We have had democratic ideals ever since our nation began, but only on rare occasions have we released them under dominant action. Under world war pressure we are beginning to think definitely in democratic terms, which we have always known but have not so often used. I think we are safe in saying that England will emerge after this war a nation far more like our own, and the demand for human beings working together for survival is going to profoundly affect all of the artificial standards of life by which social orders have been corrupted. I think we shall see the emergence of a Europe much chastened, and very much more capable of sustaining democracy.

Adolph Hitler thought democracy was dead; he made a very important contribution to democracy by opposing it; for he has made people see it and become aware of it. Attacking it he brought out its whole strength. By declaring it to be useless he has shown a thousand ways it can be useful. By declaring it to be undesirable he has made it desirable to the whole world. As Mephistopheles says in *Faust*, "I am part of the power that still works for good while ever scheming ill." As ever, the attack that would destroy the hopes of men has given men new hope; the attempt to take our liberty from us has brought out the strongest in us; those who would have persecuted us have brought us together. Nothing releases strength like tribulation. So instead of being, as Adolph Hitler thought, a very sick and dying creature, democracy is the sleeping giant. By its very nature it is not bombastic. It does not always tell how great a force it is, or how often it can act. But it is part of an inevitable and irresistible motion in society, and because it is an irresistible motion human beings will sometime emerge into a condition of peace and security. Since the mid-Atlantic conference of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill we have become

possessed of a great new constitution of democracy. Two great democracies united to produce it. They never would have united if it had not been for the world war crisis. So out of the stress and strain of opposition is emerging a great new strength; democracy tried and tested has been proven, and goes on now to the inevitable, backed by the increasing integrity of world peoples; all justice is natural and orderly; in the end that which is right inevitably asserts itself; but man must ever defend his beliefs by living them. To the degree he lives them he will no longer have to fight for them.

### A PHYSICISTS' PEACE <sup>4</sup>

Of our military victory there is not the slightest doubt, in view of the comparative resources of the opponents. But let us be equally sure of victory in the peace—victory for the principles for which we fight in the world struggle today.

What, then do we fight for? We fight for a world organization of society in which a maximum of human effort is available and effectively used for improvement of the physical, mental and spiritual well-being of all mankind. This calls right now for the destruction by force of those who have made this war for an opposite purpose—the utter degradation of all mankind to the service of the conquerors.

This will not be easy but in the struggle we shall learn many valuable lessons. We shall learn to work together and we shall learn our strength when united in a worthy cause. We shall learn the joy of tremendous effort and sacrifice. We shall learn enough that never again shall we go through a period of dull, stupid, enervating stagnation such as we went through in the 1930's.

<sup>4</sup> By Dr. E. U. Condon, Associate Director, Research Laboratories, Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company, East Pittsburgh, Pa. Scientific Paper No. 1070. March 24, 1942.

After the enemy's will to conquest has been broken, then our real battle begins. Great areas will have been devastated, as even today are not yet reclaimed some of the battlefields of the First World War in France. Men will be battle-scarred and weary. Spiritual force will be at low ebb. We shall all feel like relaxing. But this we must not do. I want to outline roughly some of the things we must be prepared to fight for when the shooting war is over.

In the first place let us be clear about the fact that there will be no lack of important work to do, as there never has been. Even in America, richest nation in the world, vast millions of our people are today under-nourished, improperly housed and inadequately clothed. Think then of the enormous task that lies ahead in bringing to all mankind simply the material benefits which a small fraction of the people enjoys today.

Let us therefore pledge ourselves not to betray the heroes of this war in the peace. Let us make a pledge to continue the struggle for human betterment after the last shell has been fired—and with the same fierce earnestness that men are now displaying in defending their homes against the invaders.

This Battle of the Peace shall be the most glorious adventure of the human race. Every man, woman, and child in the world shall devote himself to it. The world's national and racial groups shall strive in keen and wholesome competition for the honor of making worthy advances and to help other less fortunate groups to go forward.

To win this battle we shall have to make many changes in our ways of life. We shall need to evolve a world political organization with power to maintain a society free from disturbance by aggressor groups. This is not nearly as difficult as many people suppose—given that we clearly understand our purpose and act accordingly. How much easier it would have been to stop Hitler in 1934 than now!

As citizens of a democracy we must mould our political organization to the form most suitable for the task ahead. The

political solution resides, I am sure, in a close union of the allies now resisting the aggressors on a basis which provides for the gradual extension to all mankind of the liberal forms of democratic government of our own Constitution.

We shall learn to apply the rational methods of scientific investigation and experiment to the problems of political and economic management.

We shall insist on a much larger public support of scientific research than ever before—not in the petty spirit of augmenting the private position of the scientists, but in recognition of the importance of research to the accomplishment of our goal. Instead of an NDRC we must have a vigorous and flourishing WPRC—World Progress Research Committee.

We shall face an enormous task in re-educating a whole generation of Germans and Italians, whose orientation at present deprives most of them of understanding the ideal we are fighting for. This will have to be worked out by a mass program of occupational therapy in which these unfortunate individuals are given an opportunity to labor at reconstruction of the devastated areas, under conditions which will also open their hearts to an understanding of what we fight for. This reconstruction, including the physical act of carrying back the loot they have taken from the invaded countries, will keep the Nazis busy for a long time,—and definitely out of mischief if properly supervised.

Such a program for the peace will find the physicists able to serve in a way which will entitle them to a place of honor. It is they who are charged with the duty of gaining as completely as possible a rational understanding of the physical forces of nature. This understanding it is their duty not only to gain but to pass on to others who will put it to use in improving the physical well-being of all mankind.

The educational program we shall face is colossal. There has already been a hideous destruction by the Nazis of scientists, and libraries and scientific equipment in Europe. There has

been a terrible interruption in the training of scientists,—and anyway the number of persons who were trained in science before the war is now known to be totally inadequate for the work of the future.

### FIGHT FOR THE FUTURE <sup>5</sup>

We face a future so wonderful that a glimpse of it will bring tears to the eyes of our young men, and rejoicing that they may suffer for it. We are bearing this future in the body of our wartime world; only we aren't aware of it; we have not yet felt it stir.

Yet it is within us! What is it that we look for in a good society? This war can bring it about. Do we want economic equality? Under the pressure of war we are moving rapidly towards it. Do we want a fully functioning society? We are about to achieve it, for the first time in twenty years. Do we want minimum standards? A scientific rationing system will force them upon us. Do we want industrial cooperation? Never have we had such a spirit as now exists in our factories. Do we want an end to discrimination? We have so much work to do that it no longer matters whether the hands that do the work are black hands or white, a woman's or a man's hands.

Do we want international cooperation? Never has it been as swift and beautiful in its growth as in the past year; never has it been so real as it is today.

Only understand it, recognize it, value it. All of this we had in 1918, but it was never valued, never understood. We had an ordered society but everyone feared it. We had working democratic controls, but we insisted that they were only wartime controls. We had close international collaboration. But we overlooked it, we looked beyond to the creation of al-

<sup>5</sup> By Michael Straight, Washington editor of the *New Republic*. *Survey Graphic*. 31:295. June, 1942.

together new mechanisms, and so we allowed the forces of the past first to destroy the machinery which we had, then to make stillborn the new structure which we tried to create.

We cannot afford to make that mistake again. We have reached full employment. Then let us now commit America never to suffer unemployment again. We are putting an end to discrimination in our arms factories; we must demand now of our factory owners that never again will they discriminate. We have found for government the role in initiating enterprise that has been America's crying need; why should we allow anyone to dream of crippling our government's functions at the war's end, when the need will remain. The President has suggested that no one shall live on more than \$25,000 a year in wartime. Why should we ever permit again the vast inequality of wealth that has cursed our democracy? We are developing a rationing system which must finally be based on a scientific study of need. But if we find that a child needs a pint and a half of milk a day as Britain has discovered, then why not say, *now*, that never again in America will a child have less. Why not establish now, permanent, minimum standards?

We have sworn to fight a United Nations war. Then swear, now, to live a United Nations peace. Understand the strength of our present forms of cooperation and the hope that they hold out to us; today make them lasting.

Why are we for this war? We hated war because the suffering of the last war was so terrible. This war is no less terrible. We hated war because we said that the last war destroyed the moral purposes for which we fought. We were wrong. It was not the war, but our blindness and inaction during it which destroyed those purposes. The same purposes will be destroyed in this war unless we understand and act.

If we move toward the future, it will move toward us. Three thousand miles away in Europe, six thousand miles

away in Alexandria, twelve thousand miles away in Darwin, our soldiers will take heart, will fight harder, will endure pain with added strength. They will say: This is the kind of world I can die for: for it is the only kind of a world in which I could live.

### POWER AND THE PEACEMAKERS <sup>6</sup>

In facing the tasks of reconstruction . . . we should be very frank with ourselves as to the limits of practical action. It is good to dream dreams and see visions of a better world. But we should not arouse expectations that cannot be realized—otherwise we shall be merely courting the kind of frustration and disillusionment that followed the peace of Versailles. We must not expect miracles from the peacemakers. International relations are, in essence, relations between human beings. We can no more hope to reach final solutions of international problems than we can reach final solutions of problems within the family, or the local community, or the national state. No sooner do we settle one set of problems than another set arises. There can be no such thing as permanent peace, or complete order—except in prisons or cemeteries.

As long as there is freedom and life, there will be conflicts and frictions between men and between nations. That is why it may be misleading to talk about "a just and durable peace." No arrangement can be regarded as wholly just by all nations; nor will it endure for any length of time in the exact form in which it may have been reached at a given moment. The most we can hope for are periodic compromises between the conflicting interests of many nations. It should not dismay us in the least to live in a changing world. Our task is not to prevent change, but to see to it that conflicts—which are bound to occur—are settled by peaceful means, not by resort to war.

<sup>6</sup> By Vera Micheles Dean, Research Director, Foreign Policy Association. Survey Graphic. 31:311, 335-6. July, 1942.



There are also some people who believe that all they have to do in order to assure post-war reconstruction is to draw up a detailed constitution of world government, in twenty-five articles and ten addenda—and then rest on their laurels. It is, of course, impossible to predict in advance what kind of international machinery may seem most effective at the end of the war. What we must remember is that any piece of machinery is only as good as the will of the people who make it work. The League of Nations, on paper, was a good piece of machinery, and much can be learned from its experience. If the League failed to prevent a world conflagration, it was not because the blueprint was faulty, but because all the old pre-League prejudices and hostilities had been welded into this new machinery, and hampered its operation at every turn.

What we need most of all today is not a detailed blueprint for a new world organization, but a new philosophy of relations between men and between nations. This new philosophy is emerging out of the war itself. We are discovering that, even to survive, we cannot act merely for our own benefit and protection; we must collaborate with others throughout the world who share our faith. The machinery of international collaboration is being forged right now in London and Chungking, in Washington and Moscow. Today we are pooling men, raw materials, munitions, ships, to win the war. Tomorrow we must learn to pool our joint resources and our energies to win the peace.

A program of post-war reconstruction based on these general premises might include the following seven points:

1. The United Nations should proclaim that the total war in which we are engaged has, as its first and foremost objective, the liberation of all peoples—including the Germans, Italians and Japanese—from military dictatorship and the rule of arbitrary violence based on the concept of a "master race."

But, in proclaiming a war of liberation, we must realize that only men who are truly free themselves can truly free others.

We must free ourselves from our prejudices, our inner conflicts, our intolerance toward minorities in our midst, before we can offer democracy to others as a pattern for their own future. It would avail us little if, after having defeated the efforts of Germany and Japan to set themselves up as "master races," we should seek, in turn, to assume a "master race" attitude. As the French poet and aviator, Saint Exupéry, has said with five humility in his "Flight to Arras": "The real task is to succeed in setting man free by making him master of himself. . . . We must give before we can receive, and build before we can inhabit."

2. The United Nations should declare that, since they seek no territorial aggrandizement, consideration of territorial questions in disputed areas should be postponed until total victory over the Axis powers.

The United States and Britain have already declared, in the Atlantic Charter, that they have no territorial aims in this war. *But we have not, as yet, a Pacific Charter, and the peoples of Asia are rightly questioning the ultimate purposes of the Western powers in the Far East.* Stalin has indicated that Russia wants no new territory after the war—yet doubt persisted in the minds of Russia's neighbors regarding the war-aims of the Kremlin. These doubts and questions, it must be hoped, will be answered in part by the Anglo-Soviet and United States-Soviet understandings announced on June 11, but a United Nations statement on this point would still be valuable in relieving the fears of the Baltic states, Finland, Sweden, and Turkey.

3. The United Nations should proclaim the right of peoples in economically backward regions to seek political independence, and should undertake to give these regions all assistance in their power to achieve this goal by peaceful means, on a basis of racial equality.

The investment in democracy that the American people have made in the Philippines, by seeking to raise the standard

of living and literacy of the Filipinos, and promising them independence at a specified date, has brought rich dividends in terms of Filipino loyalty. So has the sympathy of the United States for China's struggle to achieve equality and maintain its territorial integrity. This trend, well initiated, but unfortunately only in a few sectors of the world, should be carried forward in India, in other parts of Asia, in Latin America, in the Balkans. We should not merely tolerate people who are unlike us in color, creed, or economic and social condition. We should actively collaborate with them, on a basis of equality, in rebuilding the world not only for our own benefit, but also for theirs, if we are not to leave all over the globe vulnerable areas of poverty and discontent.

4. The United Nations should declare their readiness to collaborate with any people, whatever its form of government, which respects the integrity and dignity of the individual and protects his rights within the state, provided he, in turn, acts as a responsible member of the community in which he lives.

It would be a great mistake for the Western powers to insist that every nation should adopt what we call democratic institutions. To force these institutions on other peoples by artificial means would merely be to discredit democracy. Democracy, in any case, is not a matter of this or that set of institutions. Its essence is respect for the individual, and a jealous concern for his rights as against the encroachments of the state. It would certainly be a strange paradox if, after the war, we should hesitate or refuse to collaborate with any nation merely because it does not have our form of government or economic system, when we have accepted war aid from Russia and China.

5. The United Nations should proclaim their belief that human welfare must be the keystone of the peace settlement, and can be most effectively assured by pooling the capital and labor, the managerial skill and inventive genius of all peoples for the tasks of reconstruction.

There has been much talk about "redistribution" of raw materials and colonies as a remedy for the ills of the world. Unfortunately this cannot be done in such a way as to satisfy all nations—for the simple reason that, when the earth was created, raw materials were distributed unequally over its surface. It will therefore be impossible, no matter how great the goodwill of the peacemakers, to cut up the world as if it were a pie, and give each nation an equal share. What we must do is make it possible for all nations to share in the wealth of the world on an equal basis, contributing to the common pool whatever resources, talents, or skills they happen to command. There is no reason to assume that this peacetime pooling would have to take place on a dictatorially regimented basis. On the contrary, it must be hoped that private enterprise and initiative, operating on a basis of voluntary collaboration, may provide the mainspring for world reconstruction. But the maintenance of private enterprise will, in turn, depend on the willingness of all those engaged in production—workers no less than managers—to act as responsible members of society, and to pool their efforts not merely for personal profit or advancement, but for the promotion of human welfare in general.

6. The United Nations should undertake, at the close of military hostilities, to maintain wartime economic and financial controls long enough to permit reconversion of industry, commerce, and agriculture from a war to a peace basis. Instead of demobilizing the machinery of wartime collaboration once war is over, the United Nations should pledge themselves to remobilize it for peacetime needs.

Today, in an hour of mortal danger, the United Nations are mingling their resources of manpower and war material. Australian soldiers, commanded by an American general, are using American equipment to defend the Pacific. An American general commands Chinese troops, while Russian aviators are being trained by British technicians in the use of British and

American planes. It should not prove impossible to carry this ready-made machinery over from war to peace.

Similar, even more highly integrated, machinery existed in the last war. But it was scrapped the moment peace was signed. We must prevent the recurrence of such catastrophic economic dislocations by remobilizing wartime machinery for peacetime tasks.

7. The United Nations should express their profound conviction that isolation and neutrality are no longer practicable for any nation, great or small; and that the hope for world stabilization lies in concerted efforts by all peoples to administer relations between nations on a basis of responsibility for each other's welfare.

To prevent the United States, and other United Nations, from slipping back into grooves of isolation and national egotism after the war, it is essential that we should reeducate ourselves right in the midst of war for new forms of international relations, based not on selfish opportunism, but on an enlightened self-interest, which would lead us to collaborate with other peoples instead of shutting them off by political and economic barriers. This reeducation is not merely a responsibility of the government in Washington. It is a responsibility that rests on every citizen of the United States; for if we are to have a fully functioning democracy, each of us must feel responsible for the general pattern of our foreign policy. Today we realize that foreign policy is not something remote from our daily lives, but part and parcel of any activity in which we may be engaged.

The magnitude of the tasks of post-war reconstruction should not fill us with discouragement or fear. On the contrary, we should feel peculiarly fortunate that we are living in a period of history which challenges the imagination, the courage, and the skill of each and every one of us. There may be few opportunities left for exploring new territories or exploiting new resources, but breath-taking opportunities open before us for pioneering in the development of relations between men and between nations.

WINNING THE PEACE <sup>7</sup>

We live in a world where each state must bear the entire responsibility for achieving and maintaining its own military and economic security. Even with the League of Nations, the Versailles treaty failed to solve this problem, which has been the unsolved problem in the major peace treaties in European history and can be regarded as the chief reason for the failure of Versailles and all the other treaties.

History shows that in our atomistic world the military and economic security of one state is, sooner or later, incompatible with the security of other states. No single large state in our world today can have a feeling of security without inspiring fear in other states. Here one has the major cause for war, for Europe has never managed to keep the peace when there have been two or more large states with power fairly evenly divided among them.

Whenever there are many strong states seeking to maintain their own security, a premium is inevitably placed on power, political and military, as the only way a nation can get security for itself. In such times there is a complete subordination of all other considerations to the single one of self-defense. When the emphasis is placed on power or defense, as in our own day or in the years in Europe prior to 1815, these are the results: centralized governments, subordination of the individual to the state, state control and supervision of all the activities of its citizens, intolerance, persecution, disregard for treaties, aggression and war.

Contrariwise, during the years 1815-1914, after the defeat of France, there was a change in the distribution of power in Europe. No single state could challenge England, whose great

<sup>7</sup> Statement prepared by Faculty Members of Yale University: Roland H. Bainton, Franklin L. Baumer, Robert L. Calhoun, Victor Goedicke, Kenneth S. Latourette, Sidney Lovett, Halford E. Luccock, Raymond P. Morris, Harry R. Rudin, John C. Schroeder, Ralph L. Woodward, and Clarence P. Shedd. *Christian Century*, 59:467-8. April 8, 1942.

financial, commercial, naval and industrial power produced the *pax Britannica* of the nineteenth century by giving Englishmen a sense of security and by making it possible to localize the wars that occurred. Important contributory factors in this century of relative peace were: the industrial revolution, the lowest trade barriers Europe has ever had, the discovery of gold in America, and the opening of non-European lands to care for the surplus of peoples and goods produced in Europe. The distribution of power was changed when industrialism made states on the continent strong, when Germany and Italy became unified, and when the above-mentioned contributory factors ceased to function any longer as safety valves. But during this century of peace, when peoples were freed from the paralyzing fear of war and were able to think of other matters than power, there was an emphasis on the rights of the individual. It was then that the world made some of its greatest cultural gains for democracy by extending the franchise, the emancipation of serfs and slaves, tolerance, mass education, the expansion of the Christian missionary movement, a phenomenal development in letters and in science.

We believe that peace is essential for the preservation and development of the best in our culture. We cannot expect it to come by chance, as it came in the nineteenth century. We shall have to bring it about by conscious effort. We know that the achievement of peace is the most difficult task man can undertake. Before we make our own suggestions we should like to consider pending proposals.

A. We are convinced that Americans will have to surrender the notion that there can be any security in a policy of selfish isolation. Rich as our country is, it cannot afford the costly military burden such a policy requires, to say nothing about the effect of such a policy on our social and political institutions. In general, it is the purely national or isolationist effort to solve the problem of military and economic security that has led to wars of aggression and to imperialism. Working by itself, a country

will be secure only when it has direct control of a large empire and its rivals have virtually ceased to exist. The worst fate confronting our country would come from a reversion to isolation.

B. The only official policy that America can seriously consider at the moment is that embodied in the Atlantic Charter of August 1941, and later developed at length by Secretary Knox in an address before the American Bar Association at Indianapolis on October 1, 1941. It suggests that England and the United States should police the world for the next hundred years. We are utterly opposed to this policy because we are convinced the time is past when any national or racial minority can dominate the world. Such a program leaves many other peoples out of consideration: China, India, Latin America, Russia, to omit the countries now hostile to us. The nations denied participation in this plan for the future are many enough and strong enough to block it successfully. Peace, security and prosperity will not come to England and the United States in that way. Against this suggested solution can be cited the same general arguments deemed appropriate to our case against domination by Nazis or by Japanese.

C. Some people think a solution can be found in some kind of "balance of power." The "balance of power" is not an alternative to what we have; rather, it is a description of what we have. It puts the emphasis on power, with the disastrous effects history knows that policy to have. It pins its faith on the success of the principle in the nineteenth century without a thought of the peculiar conditions making for that success. It forgets that many countries have invoked that principle to their own ruin. Let it not be forgotten that, in applying the principle to check France in past centuries as well as in the 1920's, England helped to make Germany strong; that to check Russia in the Far East, England helped to make Japan strong. No country has proved itself wise enough to make use of the principle with any assurance of success.



The only hope for our world lies in an impartial system of collective security, that is, some kind of federal authority with delegated jurisdiction over member states. This body must assume the burden of policing the world after disarming all nation states, of assuring all nations a free and equal access to markets and raw materials, of securing the freedom of the seas, of internationalizing such important highways of communication as the Suez and Panama canals, of upholding the principle of racial equality, of guaranteeing minorities the protection of their cultural rights, and of taking steps toward the eventual elimination of barriers to the free movement of goods and peoples across existing boundaries. These are the essential matters in which the League of Nations proved least effective.

We do not believe for a moment that such a program is capable of easy realization, that it can be accomplished without sacrifice, and over night. There is no longer any choice as to whether there shall be any sacrifices or not, for no policy is possible without them. Our only choice now is in regard to the objectives bought with such great cost. It is of greatest importance that our goal be made worthy of the terrible sacrifices we are called to make. We stand where Europe stood in 1500, a world of many states that had to fight one another for generations before the peace of the nineteenth century became possible. To avoid a repetition of that terrible history is our present job. It can be done if we can emancipate nations from the slavery they impose upon themselves by their isolated efforts to have security. Hard as the task is now, it will be harder with the passing of time because of the ever widening distribution of power among the states of the world. Man is now called on to perform his greatest creative act, and we are sure that his good will, intelligence and courage are equal to the job. Every alternative is bound to fail.

To this end we make the following suggestions:

1. England and the United States should repudiate their declared intention to establish an Anglo-Saxon world hegemony,

even as a transitional measure toward a future system of collective security. We must realize that we shall need as much international support for peace in the post-war world as we need now in the current struggle.

2. England and the United States should abandon their intention to restore sovereign rights to the occupied states in Europe. A system of collective security, impartially worked out, is a far better guarantee of cultural autonomy and minority rights than a re-established political sovereignty compelling nations to work out their own costly security. We should remember that Europe's small states have been the most ardent supporters of collective security.

3. The Atlantic Charter should be scrapped as a declaration of principles and in its place there should be an immediate commitment to a system of collective security extending beyond Anglo-Saxon borders. A beginning should include the United Nations. The presence of Japan and Italy on Germany's side in the present war shows that wartime alliances do not automatically lead to peacetime friendships. Only harm can come from a policy informing our allies that we desire their support only to win the war and not to "win the peace." Steps already taken by our government toward the lowering of tariffs, toward currency stabilization, and toward closer international cooperation generally merit full approval. Further steps of a concrete nature that could be taken now would be: the abolition of racial discrimination in immigration quotas, which should be on an impartial percentage basis; the removal of racial discrimination in the matter of naturalization; and the adoption of immediate steps toward the abolition of extra-territorial rights and other special privileges in China.

4. We must realize that we have to live with Germans, Italians and Japanese in the future unless we plan to exterminate them. We need to encourage in enemy countries some hope that they have a choice other than annihilation. Otherwise one has to dread the kind of warfare that is certain to result in the

attempt to avert defeat. Wilson's Fourteen Points were influential in hastening the end of the war in 1918; more than verbal assurances are needed this time because the Germans feel they were tricked by Wilson. Commitment to a form of collective security in which even our enemies may participate is the only way we can encourage the friends of a just world order in countries like Germany and Japan.

5. We must change the present program, which calls for a complete victory over our enemies before permitting any talk about peace. A long war, in which inevitable brutalities and propaganda have the effect of convincing us that our enemies have no possible claim to decent treatment, is the greatest psychological threat to "winning the peace." President Wilson discovered that in 1918, when he found it impossible to educate the American people in behalf of the kind of peace he wanted and had to go to Paris without the support of his own nation. Every student knows and the Atlantic Charter admits that access to the world's markets and raw materials is an essential condition of world peace. We must now face the fact that, if we still want peace to last when the war is over, we must stand ready to give our enemies the very concessions we denied them before the war began. It will appear that we are deliberately rewarding them for having imposed a cruel war upon us, for killing sons and brothers. We shall need measures that will force us to do what we ought to do at the end of the war if we seek an enduring peace. Our only safeguard is a specific commitment to that kind of peace now and the initiation of moves *now* toward its *realization*. It is of the utmost importance to accompany the war effort by a peace effort.

### AMERICA LOOKS BEYOND THE WAR<sup>8</sup>

In Europe, and in fact throughout the world, an old order is dying. Its demise is marked and abetted by persecutions of whole peoples and by lightning wars, by the disintegration of

<sup>8</sup> By Joseph Hirsh and Leonard Allen, Washington, D. C. *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*. 22:317-23. March, 1942.

old institutions and habits of thought, and by the spread of new values, totalitarian economics, and a new morality. The tidal forces at work have already left their imprint upon us. Long before the declaration of war on the Axis powers, the movement toward a highly controlled economy and the increasing tendency toward centralization in government—just two among a host of developments—were suggestive of the extent of the impact of *new* Old World conditions on our own form of life.

However much we may dislike the kind of world that has been springing up about us, it has become evident increasingly that a master plan is in the making. Today we realize that if America is to survive the present conflict successfully, we must not only prepare for the effective prosecution of the war but we must look beyond it and plan for the future. In the words of President Roosevelt, shortly after the declaration of war, "We are going to win the war, and we are going to win the peace that follows." And winning the peace means continuing and constructive social planning.

A cursory review of current *war plans*, however, would suggest the tremendous difficulties and large number of variables to be taken into consideration in mapping *post-war* plans.

In order to plan for the future, therefore, it has been necessary to establish certain working hypotheses. These may or may not be self-evident, but in the presentation of the following discussion it may seem worthwhile to list the more patent ones.

1. An unequivocal "allied" victory—no stalemate, no compromise—is basic to any thought of post-war planning;
2. Our domestic life is and will be interwoven incontrovertibly with the international future;
3. The capitalistic system, probably with a greater measure of control than has heretofore been exercised, will be the economy after the war is over.

Current post-war thinking and planning is being conditioned as much by present as by anticipated domestic dislocations. It is admitted generally that the unsolved problems that have been with us these past ten or more years will be with us to a greater

degree after the war is over. For as a matter of fact, the cataclysm now upon us is due in large part to the failure of nations to resolve these problems in domestic as well as in international forms.

The war is not only accentuating old problems but is creating new ones. We have before us the continuing problems of conservation and effective utilization of natural resources—of land, of water, and of energy resources. Despite planned and unplanned efforts, individual and collective efforts, we still have with us the multifarious problems concerning human resources—of housing and public education, of employment and health, of welfare and recreation—just to name a few.

When the war is over, there will be in addition a complex and highly geared economy which will have to be demobilized. Defense industries will have to be adjusted to peacetime needs and peacetime production. Employment will have to be found for workers in defense industries, for youths entering the labor market, and for demobilized soldiers. Provision will have to be made to prevent cities which flourished in the sun of the defense effort from falling into decay. Something will have to be done to prevent uncontrolled labor migrations which may reach—or exceed—the rural migration of farmless families of a few years ago. Taxation and fiscal policies generally will have to be re-adjusted. Assistance in terms of men, money, and material will have to be furnished for the reconstruction of a prostrate Europe.

These and countless other social and economic problems of tomorrow call for direct action now if we are to avoid the chaos of 1920 and of the early 1930's. In those latter days, just as today, there was an urgent need to meet a critical situation. So we resorted to "made" work. Criticism naturally and inevitably followed. We may recall the choicer thrusts: "paper-shuffling," "leaf-raking," "shovel-leaning," and that greatest accession to popular English, "boondoggling." What the critics—and those on the sidelines too—failed to recognize was that something had to be done; it had to be done fast, and there were no guides, no precedents to go by.

Today we have some guides, plus the challenge of past mistakes and the stimulus of crisis to do something about these problems. In current post-war planning, moreover, we have the opportunity to take a forward step toward establishing an improved economy and a healthier, more nearly secure society rather than merely to re-establish the pre-war order. In post-war planning today we have the challenge to rededicate ourselves to the highest ideals of American democracy, a democracy that says it will be commonly accepted that no one shall suffer needlessly from sickness and disability through want of medical care, and that our medical service shall be so organized and developed as to foster health, not merely battle disease. It will be commonly accepted that every child be afforded a full education; that every worker be assured employment with basic wages and hours under satisfactory working conditions; and that our land, our natural resources, and our human resources will not be wasted or used as pawns in the hands of political and industrial speculators.

What we must do now is to determine the possibilities, lay our plans, and proceed when peace comes—or before. Some effort, happily, is already being made in that direction. Many old-line governmental agencies have for years projected long-range programs. Some of these agencies and many others are concentrating specifically on post-war problems and are setting up plans to meet them. Among the more active agencies operating in this field are the following:

*National Resources Planning Board.* As part of its long-range program in resources, economic, and social planning, it is conducting special post-war studies. In addition to land, water, and energy resources, studies also include the scientific resources of the country. Economic studies include public works, employment, industrial location, transportation, and fiscal policy. In the social field they deal with relief and social security policy, education, recreation, youth, housing, and to a lesser degree, personal services.

While considerable attention is being given to meet health and nutrition problems during the war period, there is little or no long-range post-war planning being undertaken in these fields by the Board or other agencies.

Recognizing the tendency of many departments and governmental bureaus to regard particular problems and areas of activity as their special preserve, the N.R.P.B. has been seeking to counteract this tendency and to coordinate post-defense planning activities within government through inter-agency conferences. This is indeed a salutary objective, but in a number of cases the wish has been father to the thought.

The N.R.P.B. has been operating in another liaison capacity. In an effort to profit from current post-war planning in Britain, it has sent representatives to study conditions there and in other ways has kept in close touch with changing events abroad.

*U. S. Department of Agriculture.* The Inter-Bureau Coordinating Committee on Post-Defense Agricultural Programs, with representatives from the various Department bureaus, was established to operate in three broad fields: (1) long-term agricultural planning as it relates to the total national economy; (2) building a shelf of rural works, *i. e.*, forestry, flood control, soil conservation, which will, on one hand, provide useful work for people in rural areas and, on the other hand, improve rural life and productivity; (3) rural welfare—education, health, nutrition, and the other facilities and services needed by farm families.

*U. S. Department of Commerce.* Under the aegis of this department, studies are progressing on a number of problems, such as the international financial position of the United States, our foreign trade and investment situation under varying post-war conditions, and the role that business can play in post-war period. The development of a private (business) works reserve, similar to the public works reserve, discussed later, is a potentially important activity of this Department's work.

*Federal Reserve Board.* One of the broader studies conducted by the F.R.B. deals with the combined effects of the defense program upon our economy and the probable changes in American foreign trade which may be expected as a result of the war. Several other post-war studies cover the following problem areas: (1) housing and urban redevelopment and rehabilitation; (2) federal, state, and local fiscal relationships; (3) national and local taxation; (4) American, British, and Canadian relationships after the war is over; (5) manufacturing capacities in foreign countries and raw material supplies. Some of these studies are being conducted in cooperation with the Treasury Department and with other agencies.

*Federal Security Agency.* A Program Planning Committee, comprising various departmental representatives within the Agency, was set up in August 1941 to devote special attention to post-defense problems in the service fields (education and recreation, welfare and social security, health, and youth) of the component bureaus of the F.S.A. To date only a few meetings have been held and no program of activity can be reported at this time.

*U. S. Department of Labor.* The Bureau of Labor Statistics has been cooperating with the N.R.P.B. in studying post-defense employment problems. In addition, a Post-Defense Labor Problems Division has been established to study trends in wartime dislocation of the American economy. It is hoped that from these studies will come: (1) a reasonable projection of the development of our future economy; and (2) attainable goals which we can reach after 15 years of peace. These extrapolations are being based upon studies of income patterns, population trends, technological changes in industry, and related data.

*Treasury Department.* Post-war studies carried on by this department primarily concern fiscal and debt policy, and taxation.

*U. S. Department of State.* Under the aegis of the State Department a group of officials representing various governmental agencies are, at present, discussing and accumulating in-



formation on many post-war problems. A Division of Special Research has been established to study future international relationships and problems and aims to lay a broad foundation for world reconstruction.

*Economic Defense Board.* In July 1941, this Board chair-manned by the Vice President and consisting of representatives of the various Cabinet posts, was set up by the executive order to advise, coordinate, and integrate various defense activities; to investigate and advise the President on post-war economic reconstruction; and to review proposed or existing legislation relating to economic defense measures. In line with this latter aspect of its activities, the E.D.B. has been charged with the blacklisting of Axis concerns. In a sense, the E.D.B. may be considered the ministry of economic warfare.

While at this writing there is little to report of this organization's activities, it may well be the single coordinating agency for all governmental post-war planning activities which, ironically, often appear to be working at cross-purposes rather than toward a common goal.

*Public Work Reserve.* Early in the summer of 1941 the P.W.R. was established by Presidential authorization to build a national "shelf" or reserve of works programs which *local* and *state* agencies feel are needed and plan to undertake in the public interest. The organization was set up under the Federal Works Agency, receives technical supervision and counsel from the N.R.P.B., and funds from the W.P.A. The purpose of the Reserve is twofold: (1) to secure from all local and state governmental agencies a listing of anticipated public needs for capital improvements and public services over a five- or six-year period; (2) to assist these agencies in the development and maintenance of up-to-date programs and plans for such work.

The P.W.R. will embrace programs to develop resources, services and facilities. At the present time, through its field staff, it is seeking to determine the volume, nature, and dis-

tribution of this potential public work which, according to preliminary estimates, exceeds four billion dollars a year. Although plans for work programs are being accepted currently, no commitments are being made by the P.W.R. as to the source of funds, nor is there any obligation exacted from the agency proposing the work that it must undertake it at some future date.

This, very briefly, is the picture of post-war planning in Washington today. All told there are more than fifteen federal agencies and scores of non-governmental organizations throughout the country—professional, civic, social, farm, labor, and industrial groups—which are devoting considerable attention to specific post-war problems which come within their purview.

The most pressing task facing governmental and non-governmental organizations concerned with this planning is to define, anticipate as far as possible, and document many post-war problems so as to reduce to a minimum the need for improvisation afterwards. Among other things, such a job calls for: (1) the setting of *attainable goals* within the present or anticipated framework of government and national economy; (2) establishing standards of work, physical facilities, and of services which are *not* based wholly upon present trends (since these represent problems which have never been adequately solved); (3) extrapolating beyond the suggestive limits of present trends or past crises without necessarily becoming utopian; (4) interrelating and coordinating various capital improvement and public services programs, and interrelating and coordinating improvement *with* service programs.

Out of this welter of planning by agencies and individuals will undoubtedly come a little of the two extremes in planning—nothing and utopias. The brave-new-worlders will blueprint another Shangri-La for us, a world of sixteen-lane coast-to-coast super-express highways, of glass houses and capsuled food, which will be germless and povertyless, where planned cities and decentralized industry, scientific population control, farm-

ing, and forestation will be governed by a world federation which will have outlawed War, with a capital W, once and for all!

What will come out of our present planning efforts, however, will be a healthy compromise between the two extremes. Very likely we shall have expanded social services which will probably include health insurance in some form. Very likely we shall have a greater measure of economic control of private industry, without necessarily destroying that sacred cow of our fathers—individualism. Very likely we shall have a more effective and intelligent utilization of our natural resources. We shall take these and other forward steps.

This certainly does not measure up to the picture of a brave new world but, in reality, it is a revolutionary idea at a time when the world is committing hari-kiri. The idea that plans are in the making to prevent the crises which have inevitably followed every war and to create a world that is a little healthier, just a little more secure than the world we have been living in, is the one shining light which will give every individual the strength and the courage to see this fight through to the end.

### RELIGIOUS GROUPS AND THE POST-WAR WORLD <sup>9</sup>

During the last war, religious groups in the United States did not do any extensive planning with respect to the post-war period. A commission on "The Churches and the Moral Aims of the War" was created by the Church Peace Union and received the support of the Federal Council of Churches, but beyond this, the churches devoted themselves primarily to furthering every kind of activity calculated to win the war. They did their share to put over the Liberty Bond Campaign

<sup>9</sup> By Louis Minsky, Director of Public Relations, National Conference of Christians and Jews. *Contemporary Jewish Record*. 5:357-72. August, 1942.

and to arouse the proper martial spirit among the people. From many pulpits it was thundered that the conflict was a holy war. There was not much realization, however, of the post-war obstacles to a just and lasting peace. Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk of the Federal Council of Churches has gone so far as to say that the churches were disposed to believe "that the defeat of the Kaiser would be followed by a thousand years of peace."

Today, the attitude of religious groups toward the war and toward the peace to follow is more sober. Having repented of sins committed during the last great conflict, religious leaders are determined that this time the churches will be a real force for sanity and justice. This determination demonstrates itself in several ways. First of all, religious groups are attempting to act as a brake against hate and hysteria. This is true not only of the churches of the United States but also of religious groups in Great Britain. They believe that hate of the enemy is not only contrary to the spirit of religion but also that it will impede a just and lasting peace.

Nor, by and large, are religious groups proclaiming that this conflict is a holy war. The majority of churches are supporting the war effort, and a growing number of churchmen believe that the will of God involves the defeat of Hitlerism. But on the whole, the tendency is to view the war as a tragic necessity, not as a crusade blessed by God. The Christian Church, in the Second World War, is struggling to remain the Church and to resist such pressure of war fervor as would make it untrue to its own genius. Its task, as clergymen see it, is to intensify the ministrations of religion to the men in the armed forces, to provide spiritual leadership for camp communities and defense areas, to furnish relief to the victims of war, to offer comfort, courage and stability to the civilian populace, and, in that sense, to maintain morale, and finally, to work for a just and durable peace.

One hears more talk among religious groups about "winning the peace" than about winning the war. To quote Dr. Van Kirk again: "In all lands where freedom of discussion is still enjoyed, church leaders are talking about tomorrow's world. They are thinking, planning, praying." More than sixty major statements on the nature of the post-war world have thus far been issued by religious groups in various countries. The problem of a just and lasting peace is unquestionably the major social concern of church groups throughout the world today.

This concern is closely linked to the attitude of religious groups toward the war. Perhaps more than any other institution in the world, the Church refuses to be stampeded into accepting over-simplified explanations of the causes of the present conflict, which attribute it solely to Hitler's ruthlessness and ambition. Church leaders are among the foremost advocates of the proposition that the world conflict is a phase of a world revolution through which we are passing.

Thus we find that, time and again, pronouncements of religious groups stress the responsibility of all nations, including the United States and Great Britain, for the conditions leading up to the war, and make constant reference to economic, social and other factors. The key statement in the famous Malvern Declaration, adopted by a number of Church of England leaders last year under the direction of Dr. William Temple, now Archbishop of Canterbury, specifies that "the war is not to be regarded as an isolated phenomenon detached from the general condition of Western civilization during the last period." And an international conference of lay experts and religious leaders, held at Geneva in July 1939, under the auspices of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches, listed fourteen separate causes underlying the crisis which shortly thereafter resulted in war.

Because religious groups emphasize the complexity and multiplicity of the causes of the war, their pronouncements relating to the post-war world are also complex. In one important

respect, their recommendations differ from most proposals advanced by secular groups. For, whereas the latter lay stress upon the need for changing systems, the former declare the necessity for changing individuals as well. A better world, say the religionists, cannot be achieved by any legal formula alone. It requires good men, who have a sense of justice and compassion. That is why some declarations, notably the Malvern pronouncement, advocate the entrance of practicing Christians into politics, trade unions and all other bodies affecting the public welfare, and why Pope Pius XII has stressed the development among peoples and rulers of a sense of deep responsibility, justice and universal love.

It also explains what is a distinguishing feature of religious proposals for the post-war world, namely, that they speak more in terms of guiding principles than of concrete proposals. The churches are not experts in the machinery of government, and so they must leave to statesmen the exact working-out of details. But religious leaders insist that men in all parties and in every field adhere to certain principles which are imperative for the well-ordered functioning of a moral universe.

The movement to lay down the principles which should govern the post-war world had its origin in the thinking and planning about the social order done by religious groups prior to the war. As early as 1937 the World Conference on Church, Community and State, held at Oxford, England, brought together official delegates of 119 non-Roman Catholic communions from 45 countries who drafted a message to the churches promulgating certain principles with regard to the economic, political, educational and religious structure of society. During 1938, an international conference, held at Madras, India, on "The World Mission of the Church," likewise was concerned with the problem of creating a better world. Two significant meetings were held in 1939 before the outbreak of war: the World Conference of Christian Youth at Amsterdam, and the international conference convened by the World Council of

Churches at Geneva. These meetings had a pronounced effect upon the thinking of the churches and laid the groundwork for the present world-wide religious movement.

The issue of the peace was first raised after the outbreak of war by Pope Pius XII. On Christmas Eve, 1939, the Pope in an address to the College of Cardinals outlined five peace points, which subsequently became the keystone of Roman Catholic proposals throughout the world and received wide acceptance by non-Catholics. These were: (1) The assurance to all nations of their right to life and independence; (2) A mutually-agreed organic, progressive disarmament, spiritual as well as material; (3) Some juridical institution which shall guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfillment of conditions agreed upon; (4) The real needs and just demands of nations, populations and racial minorities to be adjusted as occasion may require; (5) The development among peoples and their rulers of that sense of deep and keen responsibility which weighs human statutes according to the sacred and inviolable standards of the laws of God. They must hunger and thirst after justice and be guided by that universal love which is the compendium and most general expression of the Christian ideal.

A year later, in December 1940, an effort was begun to give the Pope's five points and the Oxford Declaration a wider implementation. In a letter to the *London Times*, the leaders of the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Free Churches of England jointly proposed ten peace principles of which five were those of the Pope and five were additional "standards by which economic situations and proposals may be tested." The five additional standards, which had their origin in the Oxford Conference, were as follows: (1) Extreme inequality in wealth and possessions should be abolished; (2) Every child, regardless of race or class, should have equal opportunities of education, suitable for the development of his peculiar capacities; (3) The family as a social unit must be safeguarded; (4) The sense of a divine vocation must be restored to man's daily work;

(5) The resources of the earth should be used as God's gifts to the whole human race, and used with due consideration for the needs of the present and future generations.

The joint statement was signed by Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster; the Archbishops of Canterbury and York; and the moderator of the Free Church Federal Council. It marked the beginning of Protestant-Catholic cooperation in Great Britain on post-war aims, a movement which, for a time, showed great promise through the Sword of the Spirit organization, founded in August 1940 by Cardinal Hinsley to advance the reorganization of society on the basis of Christian principles. This movement spread rapidly throughout England and enlisted the active cooperation of influential Anglicans and Free Churchmen. But a year after its founding, the participation of non-Catholics was restricted by Cardinal Hinsley, who announced that only Roman Catholics could be officers.

This step dampened the ardor of non-Catholic leaders and called forth many expressions of regret. For a time it appeared as though little headway would be made in Protestant-Catholic collaboration. But recently, on May 28, 1942, a new joint statement of cooperation between the Sword of the Spirit and Anglican and Free Church groups was issued, which has been hailed with satisfaction by all groups. The statement pledges the Sword of the Spirit organization and counterpart organizations of the Anglicans and Free Churches to work through parallel action in the religious field and joint action in the social and international field. It points out that there is a large area of common ground on which, without raising ultimate questions of church order and doctrine which divide the groups, full cooperation is possible.

The Ten Peace Points appear as the first clear definition of a large common area among church groups in England. Other pronouncements which may be noted as bases for collaboration include the Malvern Declaration, the document on Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction issued by the Commission of the



Churches, the statement on a Christian Realm put out by the Church Union of the Church of England, and the social encyclicals of the Pope.

But the most dramatic dates in the chronology of the religious movement were January 7-10, 1941. On these days there convened at Malvern College, in Worcestershire, a group of two hundred leaders of the Church of England, including twenty-three Bishops (out of a total of ninety-eight), fourteen Deans, twenty-one Canons, fourteen Archdeacons, ninety Rectors, with the rest of the assembly composed of laymen and women, including members of Parliament and a number of army officers. The chairman was Dr. William Temple, then Archbishop of York, and president of the World Council of Churches. Although the Malvern Conference has often been described as a leftwing gathering, it was, according to Dean Joseph F. Fletcher, "strikingly representative of the range of Church of England orders and churchmanship."

From the standpoint of the economic order, the Malvern Declaration is an incisive critique of the norms and operations of capitalist economy. It criticizes the profit motive and calls for removal of the "stumbling block" of private ownership of basic resources, urges unemployment insurance, industrial democracy, equal educational opportunities for all, and the unification of Europe as a cooperative commonwealth. These are only a few of the recommendations. The section dealing with proposals for Social Reconstruction alone has thirteen clauses. Nor does the Declaration spare tradition when it comes to the Church itself. It condemns the Church's financial dependence upon ancient perquisites and levies, and proposes more religion and less liturgy.

While the Malvern Declaration is a crisis document setting forth Christian standards for social reconstruction, it also represents long years of study and thought by leaders in the Church of England. It remains up till the present time the most radical document on post-war reconstruction to be issued by any influential religious group.

Since Malvern, two other significant statements have been issued in England. One is a report by the Industrial Christian Fellowship of the Church of England. Prepared by a committee of economists, industrialists and labor leaders, it recommends far-reaching changes in the British system of land ownership, condemns the "immoral" aspects of the profit motive, and proposes that certain services of public benefit should be excluded from the area of private enterprise and operated by the state.

More significant, however, is the report entitled "Social Justice and Economic Responsibility," issued at the end of 1941 by the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Christian Responsibility, an official interdenominational body composed of Anglicans and Free Church leaders. It is the first representative statement of the British Anglican and Free Churches, and is regarded as a clearer and more conservative plan than the Malvern Declaration.

American religious groups became actively concerned with the post-war order early in 1940. During February of that year, the first organized effort to lay the issue before the churches of the United States was launched under the auspices of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. This was in the form of a National Study Conference on the Churches and the International Situation, held in Philadelphia under the joint auspices of the Federal Council and the Foreign Missions Conference of North America. The Conference drew up an elaborate message which called upon the churches of the world to study the bases of a durable peace and outlined certain tasks and responsibilities of churches in time of war. One of the most important sections of the message dealt with "The Churches and American Policy." In it was made a joint appeal by American churches for the participation of the United States in post-war efforts, a demand which has been echoed by a growing number of religious groups.

The Philadelphia Conference was also notable for laying the groundwork which resulted in the creation of the Commission

to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace. The Commission, established by the Federal Council of Churches in December 1940, is made up of nearly one hundred religious leaders representing various communions and five major interdenominational bodies. It has convened meetings of local church leaders in various sections of the country to discuss the bases of a just peace and has issued a handbook of data as well as three studies: a memorandum embodying preliminary views on certain basic questions of the Committee of Direction, a statement of "Guiding Principles," and a statement on "Long Range Peace Objectives."

But the outstanding accomplishment of the Commission to date was the convening, under its auspices, of a Protestant-wide study conference in Delaware, Ohio, March 3-5, 1942, which produced the most widely representative joint American Protestant statement of peace aims.

The Delaware statement condemned the "grave defects" of the profit system; repudiated the doctrine of isolationism, especially in the economic field; advocated establishment of some form of world government; and called upon the churches to wipe out the "sin of racial discrimination." The novelty of seeing something akin to a representative statement of American religious opinion on peace aims caused some to refer to the Delaware Conference as an "American Malvern" but, upon more sober reflection, it was generally agreed that the Delaware statement was more conservative than the Malvern document in its criticism of present conditions and in its recommendations for changes in the social order after the war. This was ascribed to the fact that the conference which drew up the statement represented a wide range of theological, economic and political schools of thought, that the British have been faced with capitalist congestion and unemployment for a longer period than we in the United States, and also that the British churches have been closer to the actual fighting fronts.

Both before and after Delaware, a number of denominational bodies and interdenominational groups issued studies and pronouncements relating to the post-war world. Among the more important are a statement of the American Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches (1940); a statement of the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches (1940); a report of the Exploratory Conference on the Bases of a Just and Enduring Peace, held in Chicago, May 1941, under the auspices of the Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church; a program of Peace Aims for the Churches issued by the Church Peace Union, June 1941; a report of a group of Protestant Episcopal bishops, clergy and laymen (1941); a program of "minimum obligations necessary for the achievement and maintenance of peace" issued by the All-American Friends Conference (1942); and the report of the General Assembly, Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (1942).

Roman Catholic activity in respect to the post-war reconstruction has centered largely in dissemination of the Pope's five points by bishops, clergy and lay Catholic action groups. A special Bishops' Committee on the Pope's Peace Points was formed in December 1941, to make these principles more widely known and to foster research studies on peace in the light of the papal proposals. Prior to the formation of this special committee, the bishops of the United States issued on November 14, 1941, a statement entitled "Crisis of Christianity," which repeated the Pope's proposals and dealt with a number of current issues including Nazism, Communism, national defense and labor.

In addition to this activity, two significant reports have been issued by the Catholic Association for International Peace. The first, entitled "America's Peace Aims," has the distinction of being the most concrete proposal yet advanced by any religious group for the reorganization of society under American leadership along political and economic lines. The key thesis of the

statement is that the United States must assume the obligation of leadership in post-war reorganization for both selfish and idealistic reasons. First, it has the obligation to defend itself and its people against future wars since "two world wars in one generation must not be followed by a third"; second, the United States has so long influenced Europe's fate that it must assume leadership in justice to Europe; and third, since world welfare and American welfare as well as charity to a stricken world demand a just and durable peace, the obligation of the United States is inescapable. The central emphasis upon American leadership constitutes the most outright attack made by any church group upon traditional United States isolationism.

The United States, in cooperation with the nations of America, is called upon by the Roman Catholic leaders to create two world organizations one of which would be governmental and the other economic, and two European-wide organizations. The world governmental organization would promote international well-being and engineer boycotts against any country going to war or assisting a belligerent. The international economic organization would help to guide economic life throughout the world. The European organizations would affirm and protect the rights of individuals and peoples in Europe, protect local self-government and redraw the lines of local autonomy according to needs. The second Roman Catholic report, called "The World Society," is a statement of the principles and foundations of a just peace in the light of Catholic theology and morality. It is the philosophical undergirding of the proposals for world and regional governments advanced in the first report, "America's Peace Aims."

The first declaration by a Jewish religious body was the "Program for World Reconstruction" adopted by the Central Conference of American Rabbis at its fifty-third annual meeting in June 1941. It included five main points: (1) The extension of democracy to all peoples, including those residing in colonial possessions; (2) The creation of an international organization

to adjust differences and provide for cooperative enterprises; (3) Universal disarmament and the establishment of an international police force to be used to restrain aggressor or outlaw nations; (4) The removal of social injustices which lead to war; (5) The recognition that the resources of the world belong to all the children of men and should be made available to all irrespective of national allegiance.

At its annual convention in February 1942, the Central Conference adopted a statement, entitled "This War and the Peace Tradition of Judaism," which repeated the five proposals but urged, in addition, that a Jewish peace commission be organized to undertake research and study for the purpose of implementing these principles. Conservative and Orthodox leaders were invited to join with the Reform group in the formation of the work of such a commission, and the American Jewish community was urged to contribute funds for the undertaking. It was implied that the commission when organized, would cooperate with similar Christian bodies.

In May 1941, the Rabbinical Assembly of America adopted a pronouncement on "Social Justice" which has been recognized by Richard M. Fagley, education secretary of the Church Peace Union, as a Jewish religious statement of peace aims. It is the traditional Jewish social justice platform with its emphasis upon democracy in economic as well as political life and its insistence that "only democratic processes are suitable to change our social order and inaugurate a new order of justice and peace." Thus, the extension of democracy is a cardinal point of both the Reform and Conservative statements. In few other religious statements is there such a distinctive emphasis upon the furtherance of democracy as an essential condition of a just and lasting peace. Proposals for a post-war world were later formulated at the Rabbinical Assembly convention held in June 1942. The chief point in this statement was the creation of a world union of democratic nations.

The pronouncements of religious groups show agreement on a substantial number of points. Implicit in all of them is the principle of the dignity of the human being as a child of God. Because personality is so precious, all men are entitled to basic freedom and rights which transcend political systems. This is explicitly affirmed in no less than twenty-five major pronouncements, including those of the Oxford Conference, the Philadelphia Study Conference, the British Commission of Churches, the Church of Scotland, and the World Council of Churches.

At least thirty-six statements stress the right to religious freedom, including public worship, preaching and teaching. Significantly, the most recent major statement to emphasize religious liberty is the joint agreement of cooperation between the Catholic Sword of the Spirit Movement and the Anglican and Free Church Religion and Life Movement. The right to freedom of speech, assembly and press is promulgated in a number of statements, as would be expected. One additional right is singled out by major statements for special emphasis, namely, the right of all children and youth to equal opportunities for education. This has been especially stressed in the major British statements, probably by virtue of the existing inequality of educational opportunity in England. But it is also an emphasis of a number of American pronouncements and of the international Oxford Conference of Church, Community and State.

Out of these assumptions flows the principle, specified in a large number of statements (at least thirty-five), that since all men are children of God, they should act like brothers. Many pronouncements vigorously oppose racial discrimination and warn that hatred and intolerance must be guarded against. Fourteen proposals contain specific condemnation of anti-Semitism. These include the Oxford Conference, the Madras Conference, the World Alliance for International Friendship

Through the Churches, the Philadelphia Study Conference, the Malvern Conference and the Church of Scotland.

It is to be noted, however, that religious statements are completely devoid of concrete proposals for the solution of the Jewish question in Europe after the war. In none of the well-known pronouncements is this problem given any consideration. In fact, only two statements have appeared which treat the post-war situation of Jews at all, notably the one issued by a conference of representatives of the Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain and Ireland, held at Edinburgh in January 1942, for the specific purpose of considering the situation of the Jews after the war. This brief statement follows:

That this conference of representatives of the Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain and Ireland, held at Edinburgh on January 25, 1942, having considered the position of the Jews in the problem of post-war reconstruction, deploras any denial to persons of Jewish descent of the right of equal treatment before the law and of the other rights due to their status as ordinary citizens, and urges that all governments shall take immediate steps to restore to the full status of human dignity such Jewish people as have been deprived of it, and in particular that all legislation unjustly diminishing the rights of Jews as such shall be repealed at an early date, recognizing also that liberty of conscience is an essential part of civil liberty and that free exchange of religious convictions is a necessary condition of all understanding between races and nations. The Conference urges on all governments the recognition of the unfettered right of every individual to free choice in religious faith and to the public profession and preaching of it so long as these rights do not run counter to public law and order. The Conference urges His Majesty's Government, in conjunction with the other Allied and friendly nations, to provide for some scheme of emigration for Jews who cannot find a home in Europe.

The second statement was issued in the United States in June 1942 by a group of Christian churchmen, mainly Protestant but including several Catholics, under the auspices of the Committee of Christian Leaders, Clergymen and Laymen in Behalf of Jewish Immigration into Palestine—apparently a new group—whose acting chairman is Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, of the



Church Peace Union. The statement looks forward to the establishment in Central Europe of "a social structure conformable with accepted Christian principles, in which it will be possible for Jews, as for all others, to live in dignity and freedom." But it continues by saying that "for large sections of European Jewry, migration represents the only practical program," and concludes:

It is our conviction . . . that in the post-war settlement Palestine should be made accessible to Jewish refugees from lands of persecution. We turn to our fellow-Christians asking that they concur in this statement and give their moral support in presenting this viewpoint to the American public so that when the foundations of the peace are laid, the historic injustice to the Jewish group may at last find a substantial correction.

The omission from religious statements of proposals relating to the post-war position of Jews is explained by Christian leaders in several ways. First, they say, it is the feeling of churchmen responsible for drafting the various proposals that the Jewish problem must be solved in the context of the general problem of racial and religious minorities in Europe. In other words, the establishment of a proper political and economic order offers great promise in and by itself for a solution of the plight of the Jews. Second, Christians are generally uninformed in regard to the complexity of the Jewish problem in Europe, and they are anxious to avoid statements or proposals with respect to Jews which would enter the area of the controversy between Zionists and non-Zionists. It is generally agreed, however, that a statement of Jewish peace aims which represents the consensus of all Jewish groups would be welcomed by Christian bodies and would go a long way toward securing the incorporation in Christian pronouncements of some specific proposals on the future of Jews in certain sections of Europe.

A further principle is clearly manifest in most of the religious pronouncements. The post-war world must be organized on the essential dictum that all economic institutions shall serve

human needs. Human beings must no longer be regarded as a means to an economic end. Economic power is a social responsibility both within the nation and among the nations. So strong is the emphasis upon the economic factor that Ernest Wilhelm Meyer has stated that in discussions concerning peace aims "a highly dangerous overemphasis is sometimes laid upon economics. . . . The danger becomes clearly discernible that pseudo-statesmanship, by cultivating the fallacious doctrine of the primary importance of economic factors, might try to evade the more difficult or more unpleasant political issues."

Nevertheless, religious groups insist upon the importance of the economic factor with a large degree of unanimity. Typical of their attitude is the following statement by the American Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches: "The distribution of God's material gifts more equitably among the children of men, in a machine age, points towards some form of organic technique, to insure that the prosperity of any one individual class, nation; or race, shall not be bought at the expense of impoverishing or exploiting other men."

So far as national life is concerned there is a general emphasis upon better distribution of economic opportunity, decent homes and living conditions, and a standard of living adequate for self-development and family life. More social security is demanded for sickness, unemployment and old age. More democracy in industry is urged, with greater participation by labor in decisions affecting its livelihood. Economic planning is recommended in a number of statements, the planning to be done by national economic councils or some similar representative authority. Stronger cooperative movements are advocated in a half-dozen proposals. Several statements condemn the profit motive and monopoly control of the principal industrial resources by private owners, but there is virtually no support for the idea of a cooperative, classless society. On the other hand, the thesis that production must be for con-

sumption, for the welfare of the community, is stressed in a number of instances. In a word, it is generally conceded that far-reaching domestic economic reforms are indispensable in the post-war world.

In the field of international relations, the principle of universalism is common to all religious proposals. Religious groups begin by calling for an end, or at least a limitation, of national sovereignty. The Oxford Conference declared that "so far as the present evil is political, the heart of it is to be found in the claim of each national state to be judge in its own cause. The abandonment of that claim and the abrogation of absolute national sovereignty, at least to that extent, is a duty that the Church should urge upon the nations."

And the Church has so urged. Practically every representative national assembly in recent years has echoed this indictment of national sovereignty, and it has been repeated in many of the statements on peace aims. In this country, of course, the feeling has expressed itself in a demand that the United States end once and for all its policy of isolation. The American Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches has gone so far as to say: "We in America cannot free ourselves from complicity in the breakdown of law and order which has led to the present war. Our unwillingness as a nation to accept political and economic responsibility is a contributing factor to the present state of world affairs."

Religious groups do not believe that the abandonment of national sovereignty should mean the destruction of nations. On the contrary, they assert that the preservation of a large degree of national and local autonomy is essential for a free society. For example, the leaders of the Roman Catholic, Anglican and Free Churches of England, as one of their Ten Peace Points agreed that "the right to life and independence of all nations, large and small, strong and weak, must be safeguarded." But the churches insist that nations must be subject to international law based upon primarily religious principles

(divine law). These principles, they assert, must become operative in two ways. First, a real world community of Christians must be established through the ecumenical movement and in the mission field. This is held to be an essential condition of lasting peace by no less than thirty-five Christian statements. That is why so much emphasis is placed upon unity among Protestants and, in England, upon cooperation between Protestants and Catholics. In addition, some thirteen major statements declare that a wider interfaith fellowship with people who share many beliefs is necessary.

A worldwide Christian community collaborating with non-Christians must be achieved, the churches believe, in order to set the example for cooperation between nations and to supply the moral undergirding of a just and lasting peace. But in the political and economic field the nations must be welded together in harmonious cooperation by some type of international organization, authority or government which will curb lawlessness, promote justice, and provide peaceful and legal means for political and economic change.

Religious groups present no specific or unanimous proposals with respect to the type of international organizations which are desired. Some call for a reconstructed League of Nations; others for some type of world government, commonwealth or agency with delegated powers; still others for a federation of peoples, not a league of states. Several statements urge regional federations with a super-federation to coordinate the regional authorities. Some half-dozen pronouncements urge a European federation, the most important being the Malvern Declaration. A federation of democratic states receives almost no support, nor does the proposal that preponderant power should be in the hands of free peoples.

The functions of the international organization, as generally conceived, include:

Control over the defense and foreign policies of each member-nation; execution and enforcement of treaties; supervision of general

disarmament among nations; provision of machinery for conference, arbitration, mediation, and conciliation between nations—that is, provision of machinery for peaceful revision of conditions leading to disputes between nations or groups, such as disputes over boundary lines, economic policies, etc.; promotion of health, control of narcotics, and the like; investigation of threats to peace and suppression of all violence; supervision of international trade, finance, transport, communication, and migration of peoples; responsibility to solve problems of raw materials and colonies; protection of minorities and of individual rights, even within the boundaries of member-states; coordination of labor laws and general advancement of the status of labor throughout the world.

Religious groups concede that the international organization must have the power to enforce its law and prevent aggression. Adequate sanctions, therefore, meet with the approval of twelve groups. The setting up of an international police force is approved in five statements, while use of economic sanctions is advocated by eight groups. Religious groups also proclaim that along with international political control there must be a reordering of international economic life. There must be consultation and cooperation regarding economic policies which affect the welfare of other nations either through an international authority or some parallel world economic authority.

The majority of statements are emphatic in asserting that the international authority must supervise equitable access to raw materials and markets for all peoples. The Oxford Conference stated that "the unequal distribution of natural bounties is one of the causes of war, if control is used to create a monopoly of national advantages." The Philadelphia Study Conference said:

Economic injustice, no less than political anarchy, breeds war. . . . It is neither right nor just that a few nations should own or control or exercise political domination over the wealth of the world. It is probably not too much to say that half of the world exists below the subsistence level. This it not because there is any lack of raw materials or of the good things of life. It is because economic nationalism, no less than political nationalism, has bedeviled the relations of nations.

Reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers, and international regulation of currency is likewise urged. Others stress improvement of the standards of labor and living by international agreement. Finally, there is widespread agreement that the whole colonial system must be revised and provision made for machinery for international supervision of colonies to promote their welfare and eventual self-government. The 1939 Geneva Conference of the World Council of Churches said in this respect:

The task of colonial government is no longer one of exclusive national concern or national interest, but . . . it must be regarded as the common task of mankind, to be carried out in the interests of the colonial people by the most appropriate forms of organizations. This would call for a transfer of government from the exclusive national sphere to that of international collaboration for the benefit of colonial peoples.

Accepting this statement, the Philadelphia Study Conference added: "We believe that the principle of eventual freedom for all peoples is not only the recognition of an essential right, but is also a prerequisite to the creation of that sense of justice and goodwill without which we cannot hope to rid the world of war."

Meanwhile, the churches agree on several important steps which should be taken immediately after the war has ended. First, it is proposed by several groups that a world conference of churches be called as soon as possible after an armistice to implement Christian views concerning peace. A decision to convene such a conference has already been made by the World Council of Churches. Second, it is specified that an interim or "cooling off" period before the final peace settlement is necessary. Lastly, it is suggested that a strong international organization will be needed in the transitional period for the maintenance of order, the protection of peoples and minorities, relief, and economic rehabilitation.

THEOSOPHY AND RECONSTRUCTION<sup>10</sup>

There will be a peace, when and how, it does not very much concern us for the moment. All nations are so inter-related, especially economically, that the duty of support, the duty of assistance, falls upon all alike, naturally upon the strong first. War is a special expression of hatred. It is a kind of collective hatred. There is no difference between little hatreds as between ourselves as men and women, and the collective hatred of a nation. Mental hatred causes war sooner or later.

Hatred is often due to a kind of greed. Not only the greed of the armament makers, but the little greed of the little shopman is equally the cause of war. Trickling water washes away the great embankment of a mighty river. In exactly the same way, the world's hatred is slowly being accumulated by the private hatreds of private citizens. The greatest way of adding to hatreds is of course the national hatred, where a nation gets the idea that it has a certain divine right to rule. Such a greed has during the last sixty years been growing in Japan, Italy and Germany. Fortunately here in India we have been protected from this madness. We have been so protected that there has been no need to dream of Indian expansion.

All this sense of nationalism produces intense hatred, and this hatred is added to by many factors. Look how much hatred is engendered in the last twenty years here in India between the Hindus and the Muslims. It is something ghastly. In the South we have the hatred between Brahmins and Non-Brahmins. Wherever there is hatred it is adding to the great reservoir. Similarly the economic system we have engenders hatred. Equally think of our own private lives with the way we treat our servants, the long hours we make them work, our attitude to them. In religion hatred is being engendered by any kind of an attempt at conversion. It is a surprising thing that in the name of religion hatred is being engendered. One cause

<sup>10</sup> By C. Jinarajadasa, Theosophical Lecturer and Leader. *Theosophist* (Adyar). 63:426-9. March, 1942.

of hatred is the color bar, and the hatred against the Jews particularly developed in Germany. There is also hatred on all sides for little things, such as luxuries. And there is another serious cause for hatred—the cruelty to animals. Can you imagine the spirit of hatred in the animal that is killed? And the hatred is all the more when the killing is useless as in sports.

When there comes the reconstruction, all these things we have referred to will have to go if we are to have a true peace. You cannot transform human nature, but all things will have to be modified fundamentally. I want to suggest certain fundamental principles. The first and most important matter is the relations between capital and labor. In the reconstruction a nation should take charge of both capital and labor. Here we can take a leaf out of the book of national administration which was developed by Mussolini before the war. He had slowly developed the idea of the Corporate State. He divided all possible types of workers, manual, intellectual, etc. into 19 corporations. He arranged for the corporations to have a little parliament. The chairman of the parliament was to represent the nation and there was no one who could challenge the decision of the chairman. Thus the nation must take charge of both capital and labor.

Secondly, one of the great reforms necessary throughout the world is the nationalization of land. According to the law code given by Manu, the land is the people's land whose representative is the king and there can be no exploitation. What is needed is that the nation should enter in. Now, without going to a revolution, a massacre of helpless well-to-do people, it is possible slowly to bring about such a great change, where all the land shall clearly be recognized as belonging to the nation.

In the general scheme the first thing is to nationalize the banks. The banks must represent the nation. With every opportunity for private work and industry, what we need today is the sense of the nation, that all that is being done must be finally for the sake of the nation. Similarly, too, it is the nation



which should direct commerce. The nation must say: "I am going to supervise the industries; I am going to see that there is no industry too many in number." So in mines, mills and factories, the nation must enter. You must produce for the needs of the nation and for export but not for cut-throat competition.

A completely new attitude to religion is necessary. There is hatred, because we think of God in such a limited way that we feel that God can be worshipped in our way only. The first change we need is to respect God's agents, to look upon our fellow-man as an agent of God so that you give him respect. You may have a completely different road to God, but you give him respect. If respect is developed there is ample room for each in our private divisions, and the quality of hatred will be removed from the divisions.

One principle to be clearly kept in mind, which has not been done in the past, is the equal position of women with men. It is impossible to bring about a true civilization merely as a result of the deeds of a little more than half of mankind.

The long-standing problem of color will disappear with the development of business. See how the work of the Rotaries started in America. It is an indication that wherever there are business relations intertwined, these differences of race and color become minimized.

All these great principles must be applied in the after-war conditions by a Directorate of Peoples. On the political side the League of Nations has practically disappeared, but not on the side of labor. The great International Labour Office still carries on. In the Directorate of Peoples, not of nations, even the peoples of Central Africa, who are ignorant or savages, must have their representatives. It must tell each nation: "You shall do this and not the other."

This Universal Directorate will have to have Sub-Directorates, for the whole world, to tell each nation what exchange it shall have, how much it shall export, how much money it shall deal

with. This will stabilize the exchange of the world. Similarly an Industries Directorate will definitely tell each nation what it shall go into. It has to tell exactly what commodities are wanted, how much cotton is wanted for the whole world, and what proportion must be produced by India, or Japan, and not allow each people to do exactly what it likes and upset the economic order. There must be similarly a Labor Directorate for the whole world. Because of the Air Service, there is now an increasing danger of carrying infection and epidemics from one place to another. So a Hygiene Directorate is needed. There must be a Power Directorate that will control the power of the whole world, the electric power, the water power. The general principle is that the whole world stands together, and it is the business of the World Directorates to attend to these needs.

So there has to be a Transportation Directorate that shall control all shipping and all the railways of all the countries. There is something of this now as in the last war. All the ships of the allied countries are being controlled. In the same way there has to be a world control of all possible means of communication.

All these schemes require what the League of Nations did not have, and that is a Police Directorate of the world. There was no power behind the League. The nations are beginning to realize that, if there is to be a world peace, there has to be a World Police Directorate.

If we are to have a real reconstruction that shall be permanent, we shall have to modify *everything*. Are we ready to modify all the things that are necessary? You will accept several things gladly, things that are ideal but do not concern your private lives. There are many who theoretically agree that women should be helped to advance, but who do not help them to so advance; they are not ready to give away anything that is their own. Thus every one is involved. What we need is essentially a great change. We have to change the singular pronoun "My" into the plural pronoun "Our." This will bring about a profound change. . . .

All that I have said can be summed up in one principle . . . . It is "Man is Divine"; wherefore all conditions are good or evil, in so far as they give man opportunity for discovering his Divinity. What is right in civilization are conditions which will enable man to discover the God within him; what is wrong is whatever opposes that discovery.

If we wish to see the end of war, we must have a completely different principle from "Each for himself and the devil take the hindmost." It needs to be replaced in the new World Order by the principle of "Each for each, and God for us all."

### TOWARD WORLD GOVERNMENT <sup>11</sup>

We recognize that no permanent peace is possible without law and order, and that war as a means of settling disputes has not only failed to bring order within the nations of the world, and harmony among them, but is a means of increasing strife and disharmony. In the past, many have not taken their full share in recognizing that law and justice are necessary, and that lack of them has brought us to the chaos we are in today. The development of world government is a major responsibility that pacifists ought to work on immediately.

This chapter is extremely brief and does not begin to do justice to the importance nor the complexity of the task of achieving world government. However, we started by setting up criteria by which various proposals might be evaluated, hoping that such suggestions would encourage the reader to utilize more intelligently the growing literature in this field, and that other pacifist writers might treat some of these questions at much more length.

We have as a beginning, tried to draw up (1) a Bill of Rights for mankind; (2) a list of the fundamental principles which should underlie an effective International Authority; (3)

<sup>11</sup> From pamphlet "*Pacifist Living—Today and Tomorrow.*" p. 45-52. Peace Section. American Friends Service Committee. Phila. '41.

a list of the minimum powers which should, in our opinion, be delegated to the International Authority, and (4) a brief analysis of the various plans now proposed in this field. We recognize that this formulation is *not complete or final*, but present it for the consideration of thoughtful people everywhere for use as a basis of further discussion and study.

It has become imperative to adjust man's life to increasingly dangerous conditions which have developed, in part, at least, from a lack of cooperation between nations, and in part from a too great concentration of control and aggressive power within nations. It is important that nations come into a closer union with mutual respect, and that they develop a code of laws which will be as just and fair to all as it is possible to achieve. This code of laws should recognize the individual rights of man without distinction of sex, race, color, creed or condition.

During the formulation of the Bill of Rights the various proposals made in England and in France have been closely studied. We are grateful to these groups for their work in this field, and wish to pay special tribute to Mr. H. G. Wells from whose book, *The Rights of Man*, we have adapted a number of these ideas. It must be borne in mind, however, that the chief aim has been to prepare a Bill of Rights and Powers to which pacifists might subscribe, and which may be used by them as criteria by which they can judge proposed plans for world government, and to serve as goals toward which we ought to be working.

## 1. A PROPOSED BILL OF RIGHTS FOR MANKIND

1. *Social Heritage.* It is the right of every man to enjoy, for his lifetime, and without discrimination a fair share of the social benefits derived from scientific and cultural progress.

2. *Education.* Every man shall have the right to free public education in accordance with his capacity and gifts.

3. *Right and Opportunity to Work.* Every man shall have the right and opportunity to work under conditions which safeguard health and to earn enough to meet his needs including a minimum standard of leisure and cultural activity.

4. *The Right to Buy and Sell.* Every man shall have the right to buy or sell, without discriminatory restrictions, anything which is compatible with the common welfare.

5. *Private Property.* Every man shall have the right to hold property and shall be entitled to police and legal protection. But no man shall exploit others through the ownership or administration of property.

6. *Freedom of Movement.* Every man shall have the right to travel freely about the world.

7. *Privacy of the Home.* Every man's home and property shall be protected against the entry of others without his permission, except as prescribed by law.

8. *Right of Public Trial.* Every man accused of a breach of the law shall have the right of a public trial by his peers within a reasonably brief period of time after his arrest.

9. *Punishment.* No man shall be subject to mutilation, to bodily assault or to imprisonment under unhealthy or insanitary conditions, or to the death penalty. He shall not be forced to take drugs, nor shall they be administered to him without his knowledge or consent, except for medical reasons, and then only under competent medical authority. Any punishment administered shall attempt to be redemptive rather than retributive, and shall endeavor to reinstate the individual as a useful member of society.

10. *Freedom of Thought, Speech, Worship and Assembly.* Every man shall have full freedom of thought, speech, worship and assembly. No political opinion shall be considered a crime. He shall have adequate protection from any lying or misrepre-

sentation that might injure his reputation or character. There shall be no secret dossier kept on any individual that is not subject to his challenge concerning the information contained therein.

11. *Right of Conscience.* No man shall be conscripted for any service to which he has conscientious objections.

We recognize that the above Bill of Rights does not cover the cooperative processes which we believe should characterize man's development in the near future, nor do they state the individual's obligations to society for the enjoyment of such rights. This Bill is primarily a list of rights which the tyranny of government has tended to take away from him.

## 12. SOME FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING AN INTERNATIONAL AUTHORITY

In addition to the foregoing Rights of Man, and to the powers which should be delegated to the International Authority, there are certain fundamental principles that should underlie this Authority, if it is to be successful and satisfactory. Among these are:

1. The ultimate aim of such an International Authority shall be to include all nations of the world in its membership as soon as may be practicable.

2. Some provision should be made for voting and representation not only by governments but by individuals or functional groups.

3. Colonial possessions and dependencies shall be developed as rapidly as possible, to a point where they are qualified to enter as members on a basis of equality with existing members.

4. All legislation shall be public and definite. No secret treaties or laws shall be binding on individuals, organizations, communities or nations.



## COMPARISON OF THREE PROGRAMS FOR PEACE AND POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION <sup>12</sup>

1. *The 8-Point Atlantic Charter*, signed on August 14, 1941, by Churchill and Roosevelt (supplemented by the Declaration of the United Nations, January 2, 1942, and Letter of President Roosevelt to Archbishop Mooney, Chairman of Administrative Board, National Catholic Welfare Conference, December 24, 1941).
2. *The 5-Point Papal Peace Program* of Christmas, 1939 (supplemented by the Allocutions of Christmas, 1940 and 1941, the 1941 Pentecost Message, and Pope Benedict XV's August 1, 1917 Letter).
3. *America's Peace Aims and The World Society*—Committee Reports issued by the Catholic Association for International Peace in 1941.

	ATLANTIC CHARTER	THE POPES' PEACE PROGRAM	C.A.I.P. REPORTS AMERICA'S PEACE AIMS THE WORLD SOCIETY
I. A NEW ERA	"A better future for the world." (Introd.)	"A new order" based on observance of the moral law. (Christmas, 1940, 1941; Pentecost, 1941)	U.S. and Inter-American responsibility for a United Europe and a united world. (Section 1, app. A, B, D, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) (Ch. 5, <i>The World Society</i> )
II. HUMAN RIGHTS	Destruction of tyranny—freedom from fear. (Art. 6) Life, liberty, independence and religious freedom, . . . human rights and justice everywhere. (United Nations, January 2, 1942)	No persecution of religion and of the church. (Christmas, 1941) Read needs and just demands of peoples and ethnical minorities to be met in peaceful way, if necessary, by revision of treaties. (Christmas, 1939) No place for separation of cultural and linguistic characteristics for economic restriction for limitation of natural fertility. (Christmas, 1941)	Rights of man. (Page 13, app. C, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) International Bill of Rights, Minorities Treaties. (Page 40, <i>The World Society</i> )
III. NATIONAL INTEGRITY	No aggrandizement—territorial or other. (Art. 1) No territorial changes, save as people concerned desire. (Art. 2) Self-government and self-determination of form of government. (Art. 3)	Right to national life and independence. (Christmas, 1939) Regions where rights have been infringed. (Christmas, 1939) No violation of freedom, integrity, and security of other states. (Christmas, 1941)	International bill of rights. (App. C, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) National autonomy. (Page 12, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) Protection of colonies and correction of colonial situations. (Pages 14, 19, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) Satisfaction of legitimate national aspirations. (Ch. 5, <i>The World Society</i> ) International control over colonial areas. (Ch. 6, <i>The World Society</i> )
IV. ECONOMIC JUSTICE	Access of all, on equal terms, to trade and raw materials qualifying by "respect for existing obligations." (The London inter-	Real needs and just demands of nations and peoples must be met, if necessary by revision of treaties. (Christmas, 1939) Arrangements to give all states means to	European and world economic organization (of free organizations of employers, labor, farmers, and of government) to guide production and business, in-
	allied agreement with U.S. support, sets up a plan of post-war economic rehabilitation). (Art. 4) Economic collaboration for labor standards, economic advancement and social security. (Art. 5) The means of living in safety with boundaries—freedom from want. (Art. 6)	insure proper standards of living for their citizens. (Christmas, 1940) Economic solidarity. (Christmas, 1940) Domestic reform. (Pentecost, 1941) Rights of Migration. (Pentecost, 1941) (See also Pope Pius XI's <i>Quadragesimo Anno</i> .) No hoarding of economic resources; access of all nations thereto. (Christmas, 1941)	cluding migration and undeveloped areas, and to handle post-war rehabilitation and unemployment, poverty, economic causes of war. (Pages 13, 19, app. D, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) (Pages 25, 28, <i>The World Society</i> )
V. INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION	"A wider and permanent system of general security." (Art. 8)	Judicial institutions to guarantee treaties and revise them as needed; perhaps some special form of European organization. (Christmas, 1939; 1941) Juridical solidarity, fraternal collaboration. (Christmas, 1940) Arbitration, sanctions, world court. (Pope Benedict XV, August 1, 1917)	A European and a world governmental organization to maintain peace, administer justice, and work with economic organization. (Page 14, app. E; page 20, app. I; <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) (Ch. 5, <i>The World Society</i> ) Regional governments to enforce peace and assist in rehabilitation. (Ch. 5, <i>The World Society</i> )
VI. DISARMAMENT	Disarmament of aggressor nations, pending success of V (above) and then reduction of armaments. Abandonment of force. (Art. 8)	"Mutually agreed, organic, progressive disarmament spiritual and material. (Christmas 1939; 1941) Moral force of right substituted for material force of arms. (Benedict XV)	European air police and joint use of European military and economic power against European aggressor. (Page 14, app. E, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) World-wide boycott of aggressor or country aiding aggressor. (Page 20, app. I, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) Gradual reduction of arms and abolition of conscription. (Page 20, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) Reduction of and internationalization of world air forces; economic sanctions. (Ch. 5, <i>The World Society</i> ) Universal and immediate armaments limitation. (Page 46, <i>The World Society</i> )
VII. THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS	(Art. 7)		Importance of freedom of the seas as issue. (Pages 11, 16, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) (Advantages to countries having access to oceans must be balanced by establishment of all other points here outlined.)
VIII. SPIRIT OF RELIGION	Abandonment of the use of force for "spiritual reasons." (Art. 8) "The establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations." (Roosevelt to Archbishop Mooney, December 24, 1941)	Development of sense of responsibility among people and governments for world justice and world charity. (Christmas, 1939)	Special responsibility of Catholic Americans to save "both souls and civilization." (Page 21, app. A, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) Responsibility for world justice and charity. (Pages 15, 20, app. F, <i>America's Peace Aims</i> ) Responsibility requiring "highest moral principles, greatest abundance of charity." (Ch. 6, <i>The World Society</i> )

<sup>12</sup> Catholic Association for International Peace, 1312 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C.



5. To insure free exchange and the flow of information and ideas between nations the International Authority should be able to regulate such world-wide services as the radio, news-gathering facilities, communications, and postal services.

6. The aim of the International Authority shall be the prevention of disputes by peaceful change or the settlement of all disputes by peaceful means, the abolition of war for any purpose and complete world disarmament.

7. There shall be complete separation between Church and State.

### 3. PROPOSED MINIMUM POWERS

To be effective the International Authority should have the following minimum powers:

1. The power to settle disputes between its members. This would include provision for submitting justiciable disputes to an appropriate system of courts, and non-justiciable cases to inquiry, conciliation or arbitration.

2. The power to investigate conditions likely to lead to international disputes and to take all necessary legal action to settle them.

3. The power to control colonies and strategic points such as the Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, Gibraltar, Singapore, and the Dardanelles.

4. The power to regulate distribution of essential raw materials.

5. The power to regulate migration and to regulate and propose movements of population so that unhealthy and unjust conditions shall be abolished.

6. The power to tax people directly.

7. The power to regulate currencies, as for example, to prevent unfair practices such as varying the exchange rates through currency devaluation and outright inflation.

8. The power to remove hindrances to the free movement of capital.

9. The power to regulate commerce between members and non-members. The existing tariffs between the members to be gradually abolished.

10. The power to take the steps necessary to bring about a minimum but increasing standard of living for the entire world.

11. The power to pass laws in accordance with the above principles, powers, and proposed Bill of Rights.

12. The power to amend its constitution. The power to set up means to study and make recommendations for legislation on particular problems as they arise.

#### 4. BRIEF ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED PLANS FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION

##### I. Revivified League of Nations

###### A. Present League Set-up.

1. *Basis of membership*—Any nation may be admitted by a two-thirds vote of the assembly. A member may also be expelled by the assembly.
2. *Assembly*—The larger body composed of representatives of all member governments.
  - a. Each member state one vote.
  - b. Made up of representatives of governments—not peoples.
  - c. Decisions must be unanimous.
  - d. Admits states to membership, and elects non-permanent members to the Council.
  - e. Serves as appeal board from Council.

## THE REFERENCE SHELF

3. *Council*—Meeting frequently as an executive committee.
    - a. The "Great Powers" have permanent seats (4-6) and nine others have non-permanent seats.
    - b. Supervises mandates.
  4. Assembly and Council independent in all important items—not like bi-cameral legislature.
  5. *Secretariat*—Permanent administrative body, no separate power.
  6. *Other coordinated bodies*.
    - a. World Court.
    - b. International Labor Organization.
  7. *Committees*: Health, Disarmament, Communications, Mandates and many others.
  8. Virtually no power—Nations retain sovereignty—League can only advise courses of action, not enforce them.
- B. Proposed Reforms.
1. *Bruce Report* would divide League into
    - a. Social, economic and humanitarian section.
    - b. Political section.
  2. *Swiss Committee of the International Peace Campaign*.
    - a. League to have new spirit and more authority.
    - b. Police force and general disarmament.
    - c. Justice and reorganization of economic life.
  3. *British League of Nations Union*.
    - a. Limitation of national sovereignties.
    - b. Mandatory judication.
    - c. Limitation of armaments and some international police.
    - d. Some economic and social control.
    - e. Protection of minorities.

## II. Regional Pacts

- A. Pan-Europa — Count Coudenhove-Kalegri — 1922 —  
and four other regional groups using the United States as its economic model and Pan American Union as its political model. Therefore no political power.
  - a. Pan-America.
  - b. British Commonwealth.
  - c. Soviet Union.
  - d. Asiatic.
- B. European Federal Union—Aristide Briand—1929.  
A United States of Europe in which the member states retained their sovereignty.
- C. United States of Europe—Alfred Bingham.
  - 1. Regional groups—5 or 6, consisting of
    - a. United States of Europe.
    - b. British Empire (England would belong to both *a* and *b*).
    - c. The Western Hemisphere (Canada belongs to *b* and *c*).
    - d. Asia.
    - e. Soviet Union.
  - 2. United States of Europe.
    - a. Council of States—legislative.
    - b. Council of Nationalities (mainly cultural matters).
    - c. Assembly elected according to population.
  - 3. Development of Federal Army and Navy with gradual disarmament of national armies and immediate abolition of national navies.
  - 4. World Organization in economics—immediately.
  - 5. Colonies to be mandated or brought to self-government.

- D. New Republic—1940.
  - 1. European Federation with sub-units, such as Scandinavian or Danubian federation.
  - 2. Authority over tariffs, mandates, labor, etc.
  - 3. Federal Police Force.
- III. World Government
  - Lloyd and Schwimmer—all inclusive, non-military, democratic.
  - A. *Parliament*—10 delegates from each state to vote individually.
  - B. *Commissions* to plan economic, political, social, educational changes.
- IV. Federal Union—Union Now
  - A. *Voluntary union of Democracies*, anticipating growth to world union.
  - B. *Bi-cameral system* elected by citizens of each member unit according to population.
    - 1. Executive Board, consisting of five members, three elected directly by all citizens, one member elected by the Senate and one by the House.
    - 2. Premier and Cabinet dependent upon vote of confidence of both houses.
    - 3. Judiciary, including a supreme Court for the Union with no interstate questions excluded from its jurisdiction.
  - C. *Fields in which the Union will have authority.*
    - 1. Citizenship.
    - 2. Defense.
    - 3. Customs, free trade within Union.
    - 4. International currency.
    - 5. Postal and communication system.
    - 6. Direct taxation.
    - 7. Police and military forces.

INTERNATIONAL COURTS IN THE  
POST-WAR WORLD <sup>13</sup>

The President of the United States has set before the people of this country two objectives—the winning of the war and the winning of the peace which will follow the war. Both of these tasks require preparation—and both of them require preparation—and both of them require preparation in advance. According to an announcement made recently, some one hundred organizations in this country are engaged in an effort to prepare for the peace that will follow the war.

In all of the plans that I have seen, there is extraordinary unanimity on one point—people everywhere seem to be agreed that this war must be followed by an extension and a strengthening of international law. Yet among the people I have seen there seems to be little appreciation of how that end is to be achieved. I have heard little discussion of the methods which we may adopt for the purpose of extending and strengthening international law. Of course all of our judgments at this time have to be entirely tentative, but two things would seem to me to be necessary if we are going to achieve this general end.

In the first place, we must see to it that there is a continuance of the recent gains which have been made in international law. Those gains are very significant in two fields.

First is the field of international legislation. We hardly knew such a thing as international legislation prior to eighty years ago. The International Telegraph Union, the first of the modern leagues of nations, was established only in 1865. Today we have a large number of great multipartite international instruments which guide and control not simply the actions of governments but also the daily lives of men and women throughout the world. And we have made an extraordinary gain in this field in the course of the last twenty years. It has proved much easier to call international conferences, it has proved

<sup>13</sup> By Manley O. Hudson, Judge of Permanent Court of International Justice; Bemis Professor of International Law, Harvard University. *Annals of the American Academy*. 222:117-23. July, 1942.

much easier for those conferences to succeed after having been called, and after their work has been finished we have had the machinery and agencies for following it up to see that the ends were accomplished.

A second field in which we have made recent gains in international law is that of the pacific settlement of international disputes. Since 1920 we have made over our international law concerning the pacific settlement of international disputes, and today it is a commonplace for states to agree to settle disputes which only twenty-five years ago they thought should lie outside the scope of all agreements in this field. First of all, if we are going to extend our international law, we must find a way of continuing these recent gains.

Second, we must find a way of maintaining our judicial institutions. These institutions represent the fruit of a continuous effort of over fifty years. It was in the decade between 1890 and 1900 that we first made a serious effort to establish judicial institutions. Of course it might be easy to draw up a plan on paper for an international court which would be better than any of the plans we have had in the past. We Americans are a bold people when it comes to planning for all time to come. Some of us like deliberately to defy the lessons of experience; others of us like to proceed in blissful ignorance of what that experience is. But I find among my friends too little discussion of what the actual experience is with respect to international institutions, and for this reason my present preoccupation is with the maintenance of the judicial institutions of the past.

There are two great judicial institutions already existing: the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and the Permanent Court of International Justice. As I happen to be a member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration and a judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice, I hope you will not find me partial in my effort to weigh the relative merits of these institutions. I shall also deal briefly with a proposal to establish an Inter-

national Prize Court, with a proposal to establish an International Court of Criminal Justice, with an unofficial proposal for an International Equity Tribunal, and with various proposals that have been made for the establishment of an Inter-American Court of Justice.

First, then, let us refer to the existing institutions.

The Permanent Court of Arbitration, which has existed since 1899, is not quite what its name implies. It is rather a framework for the settlement of international disputes, a part of a system which we know as the "Hague System." The Permanent Court of Arbitration consists of a panel of men, nominated by some forty-four countries of the world as capable of serving, if they should be called upon to serve, to deal with arbitral cases between nations. The latest list of that panel included the names of 152 men. Each state has the privilege of naming four members of the Court, and they are appointed for six-year terms. Out of that panel states are free to create tribunals to handle the cases which they may have and which they are willing to refer to arbitration.

A second part of the Permanent Court of Arbitration consists of a permanent International Bureau at The Hague, the only part of it that is really permanent. A permanent Secretary-General devotes all of his time to the work. A procedure for the tribunals is laid down in the Hague Convention of 1899 as modified by the Convention of 1907.

In the course of forty years, twenty-three international cases have been referred to tribunals of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. It is a little difficult to say just what is a case before such a tribunal, for the cases differ greatly; but I think one is safe in saying there have been twenty-three tribunals which deserve to be listed as tribunals of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The United States of America has been a party in six of those arbitrations. The United States and Mexico took the first case to the Permanent Court of Arbitration in 1902—the *Pious Fund Case*. Later, the United States and



Great Britain were parties in the *North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Case*, and the United States and Venezuela in the so-called *Orinoco Steamship Case*. Since 1920 the United States has been a party with the Netherlands in the Palmas Island dispute, with Norway in a dispute concerning the seizure of certain ships, and with Sweden in a dispute which also concerned the seizure of certain ships. Eighteen of the twenty-three cases referred to the Permanent Court of Arbitration were referred before 1920; of the five cases referred since 1920, the United States has been a party to three.

The Permanent Court of Arbitration costs very little money. Its present budget is about \$40,000 a year, but of that sum \$27,000 a year is for the maintenance of the Peace Palace at The Hague. No state pays over \$1,800 a year as its share of that total expense.

Now what is the value of the Permanent Court of Arbitration? Perhaps it has not altogether fulfilled the high hopes of its founders in 1899, but one has to say, I think, that it has been useful in dealing with twenty-three international disputes. It has encouraged arbitration and the making of arbitration treaties outside of the framework of the Hague System, and it paved the way for a more adequate international court, established in 1920.

The Permanent Court of International Justice, established in 1920, is what we know in this country as the World Court. Some ten years have passed since the World Court was a subject of popular discussion in this country, and perhaps you will bear with me if I go into details more than I should otherwise do.

The establishment of the World Court represented one of the great achievements of the League of Nations. Over fifty states have lent their support to the maintenance of the Court. In 1907, at the Second Peace Conference at The Hague, we failed in the effort to establish a Permanent Court of Arbitral Justice. We failed largely because each state demanded that

one of its nationals should be among the judges, and no way was found by which a smaller number of judges might be elected to man such a court. With the establishment of the League of Nations, however, a plan was devised for the election of judges of the Court, and states were persuaded to abandon their insistence that each of them should have a representative on the Court.

The fifteen judges of the World Court are elected by two electoral bodies, consisting of the Council of the League of Nations and an Assembly of the League of Nations, plus the representatives of states which are parties to the Court Protocol but not members of the League of Nations. In the last three or four elections, representatives of both Japan and Brazil took part in voting, although Japan and Brazil were not at the time members of the League of Nations. We had a successful general election of the judges in 1921 and another in 1930; but in 1939 the election had to be postponed because the war had already begun.

Now what about the jurisdiction of the World Court? Its contentious jurisdiction is not conferred by the Statute of the Court. It depends upon the consent of various states. States may either make a specific agreement to refer a particular dispute to the World Court, or they may become parties to one of several large multipartite agreements for conferring on the Court a general jurisdiction over certain types of disputes. An Optional Clause is annexed to the Statute of the Court for giving it compulsory jurisdiction, and more than forty states have at different times made declarations giving the Court jurisdiction with respect to certain types of legal disputes. In addition to that, a large number of states have made bipartite treaties agreeing to refer disputes between them to the Court under certain circumstances. Even the United States is a party to the constitution of the International Labor Organization, which confers on the Court a compulsory jurisdiction over disputes

relating to the interpretation of that instrument and of labor conventions.

Altogether, 550—I would like you to remember that number—550 international treaties have been entered into in these years, conferring a jurisdiction on the Permanent Court of International Justice. Think what effort that means, think what a large part of the world law of the present day those 550 treaties represent.

In addition to its contentious jurisdiction, the Court has an advisory jurisdiction which is now assimilated to the contentious jurisdiction.

Now what law does this Court apply? The tribunals of the Permanent Court of Arbitration are directed to decide on the basis of respect for international law, but the World Court is given a more definite mandate. Its procedural law is laid down in its Statute and in the various rules it has adopted from time to time. It adopted rules in 1922, in 1926, and in 1931, and its present rules were adopted in 1936. On the substantive side, an article of the Statute of the Court directs it to apply international conventions, international customary law, the general principles of law of civilized nations, and judicial decisions and the teachings of publicists so far as they may be applicable.

In the course of these twenty years, 60 cases have been referred to the World Court at The Hague; 33 of them were cases of contentious jurisdiction, and 27 of them cases of advisory jurisdiction. Each of those cases was important to the peoples concerned, although some of them did not attract wide attention. And it is very interesting to note that those cases include the very kind of cases which twenty years ago states were refusing to agree to arbitrate—cases relating to their national honor and vital interests. I can cite a number of cases before the Court which clearly related to the national honor and vital interests of states—the *Eastern Greenland Case* between Norway and Denmark, for example, and the *Jaworzina Case* between Czechoslovakia and Poland.

Now what has been the reception of the judgments and opinions of the Court? I think we may take great satisfaction in the fact that in the course of these twenty years, no state has refused to follow the judgment or opinion of the Court at The Hague. So far as professional opinion goes, that is, the opinion of those who are working in international law, there is always discussion and criticism (a great many of us have criticized some of the cases, particularly the *Lotus Case* between Turkey and France), but the profession as a whole has welcomed the jurisprudence of the Court and has greatly valued the contributions it has made.

As far as the general public is concerned, I think we can say there has been only normal criticism. Some of the cases have not met with the approval of publicists, especially the advisory opinion concerning the *Austrian-German Customs Regime*; but I suggest to any critics of that case that subsequent events have vindicated the opinion which was given by the Court. On the whole, the public has received the judgments and opinions of the Court very hospitably and the criticism has been only that which any public institution must expect.

The World Court has cost over \$500,000 a year. The judges were asked to devote all their time to the job, and their salaries had to be paid. There were also the salaries of the staff of the Registry of the Court, the expenses of the Peace Palace at The Hague, and the expenses of the forty sessions of the Court held during these twenty years. A total of ten million dollars has been paid for the maintenance of the Court, paid by members of the League of Nations and by Brazil and Japan after they had left the League.

It may be asked, What is the value—what has the World Court done in this period? It is impossible to say that the Court has prevented war in any particular case. It is possible to say, however, that it has greatly extended the reign of law in our generation.

In the first place, the Court has settled more than fifty disputes between nations, and it has settled them in such a way as to remove festering centers of discord. Second, the Court by its advisory opinions has aided the smooth working of international organizations, such as the International Labor Organization of which the United States is a member. Third, the Court has undoubtedly exercised a great influence on the settlement of disputes which were never referred to it—indeed, never referred to any court at all. In that respect it is like a national court; people often settle out of court in preference to going into court, but they would not do so if a court did not exist. Fourth, the Court has greatly facilitated the building of the law of pacific settlement mentioned above. Fifth, the Court has greatly aided in the development of our substantive international law, and its judgments and opinions are constantly cited by lawyers throughout the world.

Now I have briefly reviewed the two existing judicial institutions of our time. The question is before the world of our time, whether they should be continued for the future. As to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the World Court, I think no one can have any doubt. Professional opinion, the opinion of people working in international law throughout the world, is unanimous on that point, and I think the opinion of politicians is almost equally unanimous.

The same is not to be said, however, of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. Is it really needed in our time and in the world of the future? It has this advantage: If two states have a dispute, they can refer it to the World Court if they like, and they can exercise a large control over the procedure to be followed in handling their dispute before the World Court; but they cannot choose *ad hoc*, for the particular dispute, the judges who will sit. In the Permanent Court of Arbitration, however, they can choose their judges; and for that reason the Permanent Court of Arbitration may prove useful in the future.

Today the members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration serve only one active function: they nominate the candidates to be voted on in the election of the judges of the World Court. Some other way might be found to do that, but because states may wish to choose the judges who will handle their cases, the Permanent Court of Arbitration ought to be kept alive. It is not expensive to any one nation, and I think that responsible persons would hesitate to destroy an international institution of that kind.

What, then, about additional courts for the future? If we continue the World Court; if we continue also the Permanent Court of Arbitration, should some additional court be created?

Some thirty-five years ago, in 1907, we had a great deal of discussion about the creation of an International Prize Court. A convention drawn at the Second Peace Conference at The Hague was signed by the representatives of more than thirty-five states, for creating an International Prize Court as a court of appeals. Perhaps we ought to define a "prize." If an enemy vessel is captured by the United States at sea and brought into one of our ports, in order to get title to that vessel we must put it through a prize court. We speak of the vessel as "prize"; our own courts would adjudicate upon the vessel and the lawfulness of the capture. The International Prize Court was to serve as an appellate court from the national prize courts. But the Convention of 1907 was never ratified by any state. An International Conference was held in London in 1909 to codify the law which such a court might apply, but the Prize Court Convention was never brought into force. In recent years there has been no talk of creating an institution of that kind.

Then I pass to a proposed International Court of Criminal Justice. It will be recalled that in 1934 the King of Yugoslavia was assassinated at Marseille in France. As a consequence of that crime, a conference was held at Geneva in 1937 to deal with the subject of terrorism, and one of the measures adopted

by that conference was a convention for creating an international criminal court. The idea was that State "A" might find within its borders terrorists that ought to be brought to justice, but State "A" might not feel able to take the risk of bringing them to justice; therefore State "A" would turn them over to an international court which would convict them and punish them as criminals. The Geneva convention was not ratified, however, and I think people now feel that there is little need for an international criminal court.

An interesting proposal came a few years ago from the New Commonwealth Society in England. That society proposed that alongside the World Court and the Permanent Court of Arbitration a new Equity Tribunal is needed, a tribunal to deal with international disputes not according to law but according to larger ideas of equity and justice. Such a tribunal would deal, as I understand the proposal, with what we lawyers call nonlegal international disputes. The tribunal would be manned by eminent people, and by eminent people we mean politicians. The difficulty about creating a permanent body of politicians would seem to me to be that politicians come and politicians go, while we lawyers go on forever. A politician is very useful, very eminent, one day, and the next day a writer in the newspapers must explain who he is if his name is mentioned. In other words, politicians do not stay permanent. If a court of politicians is necessary (and in fact the Council of the League of Nations has attempted to fulfill that role), I should think that it must be composed of active politicians.

I come now to a fourth proposal: At several of the International Conferences of American States held in recent years it has been proposed that the twenty-two American states should create an Inter-American Court of Justice. We once had an international court in this hemisphere—the Central American Court of Justice, which functioned from 1908 to 1918. Now it is proposed that we create a new American international court.

Two general ideas are behind this proposal. The first is that we have among the nations of this hemisphere a separate system of what may be called American international law. In recent years there have been protagonists of the idea that American international law is somehow different from general international law; but I find it difficult to lend my support to that view. The second general idea is that the American states would have more confidence in a regional court manned by men from the American states.

Of course, for many years most of the American states have participated in maintaining the Permanent Court of Arbitration. As to the Permanent Court of International Justice, I have to admit that it has been chiefly European in its scope. The cases have been largely European; there has been only one case to which any American state has been a party—the *Brazilian Loans Case* between France and Brazil some ten or twelve years ago. Yet most of the American states have supported the World Court from the start. Fourteen American states are parties to the Protocol of the Court, and nine American states have conferred on the Court an obligatory jurisdiction over their disputes. Moreover, American states have entered into some twenty-five bipartite treaties conferring jurisdiction on the Court. Only recently, Venezuela has made two such treaties, one with Brazil and one with Colombia. There has been, in other words, large support of both the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the World Court by the states of this hemisphere.

Now when one considers the difficulty of ratifying inter-American agreements, I think he has to hesitate about this proposal to create an inter-American court. A convention for maintaining the Pan American Union in Washington, opened to signature in 1928, has not yet been brought into force because not enough of the American states have ratified it. There is also an argument to be made that we must keep our international law universal. We do not want an American international law, opposed by some other regional law.



Therefore I propose that we should create in the World Court, in the Permanent Court of International Justice, regional chambers for dealing with disputes in different parts of the world as states may desire to refer them to the Court. Let us have, for instance, the possibility of creating a regional court as occasion may arise for dealing with a dispute between two or more American states, as part of a system of regional chambers within the universal organization. If something of that kind is developed, it may not be necessary to build a new Inter-American Court of Justice.

I have now discussed four proposals for the creation of new courts: a proposal for an International Prize Court; a proposal for an International Criminal Court; a proposal for an Equity Tribunal; and a proposal for an Inter-American Court. Each of these proposals has some merit, but I think our hopes have a greater chance of fulfillment if they are based on the institutions sanctioned by past experience.

Let me repeat that the present outlook does not warrant any prophecy; but the pursuit of the objective of winning the peace requires us to prepare our minds for keeping the peace once it is established. I suggest that we must look forward to a strengthened, revived international law, connected with a generally supported international organization. We must look forward to a development of international law on a universal basis, a law for all nations, for all peoples, and at all times. And I suggest that we should look forward to a continuance of the Permanent Court of Arbitration and the Permanent Court of International Justice, as judicial institutions essential to our life in a governed and ordered world.

#### PEACE AIMS: A SPECIFIC PROPOSAL <sup>14</sup>

If the aim is a lasting peace and to avoid sources of future conflict, the terms should not merely be for home consumption

<sup>14</sup> By Lynn Thorndike, Historian, Columbia University. *Political Science Quarterly*. 57:128-9. March, 1942.

and reflect our own ideals and interests, but should be acceptable to all nations concerned, to mankind generally, and to posterity. It is also preferable to make them as specific as possible in order to invite criticism and discussion rather than to leave them so vague and sonorous as to be practically meaningless and easily evaded in the future.

I would suggest the following as a beginning:

1. Abolition of all mandates and reconsideration of the territorial readjustments of 1918;

2. Internationalization of such strategic points and waterways as Gibraltar, the Dardanelles, Suez Canal, Singapore and Panama Canal;

3. Outlawing and immediate destruction of most bombers, fighting planes, high explosives, battleships, submarines, and mechanized military devices, with international control of those left undestroyed and of their future production;

4. Establishment of an international organism to control this and the aforesaid strategic places, to suppress aggression and incipient militarism, to oversee monetary exchange and fair distribution of raw materials—such as oil, rubber, coal, iron, tin—paying the producing regions a just price but charging sufficient fees to support itself and its armed forces;

5. This international board to be chosen by or consist of representatives of the following leading governments or political groups:

- 1) The United States
- 2) Latin America
- 3) The British Empire
- 4) Continental Europe west of Russia, with its various colonies
- 5) Russia
- 6) Islam
- 7) China
- 8) Japan
- 9) India

6. The international forces—army, navy and aerial—to be recruited from all nine divisions but paid from international funds and employed solely for international purposes;

7. The nine constituent groups to have small armed forces sufficient for their internal needs but not for external defense;

8. Small nations or organic minorities, under certain circumstances, to have the right of peaceful secession from one of these nine divisions to another;

9. Free trade;

10. Unrestricted travel and communication for individuals who are self-supporting and not criminal, diseased, insane or of low mentality;

11. Individual freedom of religion, thought and expression; abolition of all censorship, Gestapos, and investigating committees—this to be enforced by right of appeal from one's own government to an international court.

International inspectors will be necessary in the various localities to detect violation of the foregoing provisions, but they will replace and at least be preferable to the secret agents, propagandists, spies and fifth columnists of existing governments.

#### TOWARD A DURABLE PEACE <sup>15</sup>

For doing these things, may it not be possible to carry over into the peace period the habits and techniques of wartime collaboration now developing among the United Nations? Are not the germs of the future world order to be found not in comprehensive schemes and constitutional blue prints, but in the day-to-day interchanges now going on in Washington, London, Moscow, Chungking, Ottawa, regarding such economic matters as production and allocation of equipment, shipping problems, and raw material procurement?

<sup>15</sup> From article by Eugene Staley, *Economist*, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. *Common Sense*. 11:115-18. April, 1942.

The idea that organizationally as well as in other ways "The peace will grow out of the war," offers the advantage of gradualness. It offers a process by which a "nucleus" for future world organization may be cemented together under wartime stress, later to serve as an organizing and power center for a stable world system. It allows flexibility. Concrete problems are attacked by *ad hoc* methods, through instrumentalities which, even if regarded as more or less temporary expedients, may actually become permanent and may take on new functions beyond their original tasks.

Many of the steps in this gradual process can be taken by the executive branches of the collaborating governments without special legislation. Even where legislative approval is necessary it may be possible to center discussion on concrete issues, avoiding to some extent such broad, dramatic debates as that of 1919-20 over the League of Nations in the United States Senate. Great decisions respecting international collaboration may be built up over years out of hundreds of smaller decisions. Like the Anglo-Saxon common law, which broadens down from precedent to precedent, a post-war democratic order may perhaps grow out of concerted attacks on one concrete problem after another.

All of this is not to say that we should swallow whole the exaggerated doctrine that wartime collaboration will carry over *automatically*, or that wartime agencies will be wholly suitable and sufficient for the economic problems, that will follow the war. Goals, organizations and techniques will differ. The efficacy of mere technical collaboration can be overestimated. The fundamental problem is likely to be achievement and maintenance of unity of *purpose*, unity of *will*. "Neither the structure nor the personnel nor the objects of wartime control are suitable for times of peace," concluded the London *Economist* in an editorial on Britain's post-war problems. That point of view needs to be taken into account. We need to examine the methods and objects of wartime collaboration.

1. *Coordination of production programs.* The problem is to plan the war production programs of the different countries as much as possible as one whole. There must be agreement on such concrete points as the number and type of planes or tanks to be built in each country, standardization of design, priorities in allocation of scarce materials, delivery dates, and the quantities of finished munitions to be allocated to the different theaters of war.

2. *Joint management of shipping.* The problem is to secure the most effective utilization of a very scarce and highly strategic commodity.

3. *Joint measures regarding exchange rates and prices.* Collaboration is necessary to prevent separate national controls from working at cross purposes.

4. *Financial arrangements.* This includes lease-lend book-keeping, loans, and the like. The fundamental problem is the determination of the basis on which the costs of war equipment are ultimately to be apportioned among the collaborating countries.

5. *Joint measures of "economic warfare."* These include, for example, collaboration in enforcing boycotts against black-listed firms; collaboration in withholding fuel and supplies from ships likely to engage in blockade running; collaboration in buying up supplies of strategic commodities which might otherwise reach the enemy; pooling of economic information concerning enemy countries, with a view to the selection of targets for industrial bombing.

6. *Joint measures affecting orphaned colonies.*

7. *Collaboration in proposing and carrying through economic aspects of a peace arrangement with an isolated and defeated Axis partner or in redeemed territory.*

It is evident that the wartime tasks listed above differ considerably from the peacetime tasks listed previously, and yet there are points at which the techniques and the organizations

developed *could* carry over—with proper modifications. Treasury experts who collaborate in wartime on exchange and currency measures can probably adapt many of their joint procedures to the conditions of peace. Wartime shipping control, designed to conserve tonnage and to prevent vessels from carrying goods to the enemy, may also be important in the immediate post-war period when transport space will have to be allocated for carrying foodstuffs and raw materials to Europe and other shortage areas. Joint supply committees which handle military goods in wartime may be the best channel for organizing emergency distribution of materials and equipment in newly redeemed territory.

The really big problem in converting wartime collaboration into peacetime collaboration, however, does not lie in the technical realm at all. What was lacking after the First World War was *unity of purpose*. The Allied and Associated Powers were able to achieve and maintain a certain unity of purpose so long as they were confronted by the menace of a common enemy (though the menace of defeat had to become very strong indeed before they finally adopted a unified military command). When the war ended, bonds of unity snapped almost at once. As a result, none of the technical collaboration (on shipping, supply and other matters) that had developed during the war actually carried over into the peace.

One of the most interesting documents on the development of allied collaboration during the First World War is the report of General Tasker H. Bliss, military representative of the United States on the Supreme War Council. It is found in the Lansing Papers, Volume II. General Bliss at first believed that the Supreme War Council ought to be composed of the military commanders-in-chief, the professional experts, who would elaborate a common plan of action. Later he saw that the primary need was more fundamental: a unified *purpose*, unity of *will*. Unity of this sort could be attained only by bringing the high political leaders together for joint decisions, so that

separate national preoccupations could be subordinated to a clearer view of the common task.

Economic collaboration, too, must be based fundamentally on such psychological unity. The tendency of Allies to fall out among themselves is notorious. The purposes regarding which unity has to be achieved in time of peace are vastly different from those of wartime. Certainly they ought to be. It would be disastrous if post-war economic collaboration should consist of measures of continued economic warfare against Germany, Italy, and Japan. (This was the type of post-war economic collaboration actually contemplated at an Allied conference held in 1916!)

Among democratic countries, little can be done toward carrying wartime collaboration into the post-war period unless there is strong public acceptance of the desirability of continued collaboration. Such public acceptance can hardly be founded on "reason" alone. Common symbols, feelings, attitudes, loyalties are most important in politics. One ounce of effective political symbolism accepted by influential groups and by people generally is likely to be worth a pound of technical collaboration. Acts of union, common declarations and charters, supra-national legislative assemblies (chosen in part by direct vote of the people or by functional groups instead of exclusively by national governments), supra-national executives so set up as to be able to win loyalty and support to themselves rather than to the separate governments that create them—all these have great importance. *The techniques of gradualism depend for their success on the development of unity under the influence of successive acts of practical collaboration. But they may break down because of a lack of symbolic unity.*

It is a great error, though one very commonly made, to underestimate the importance of political structure as one of the factors determining the *substance* of economic and other policies. Political "machinery" is not merely a means of executing a common will that already exists; it is also a means of *forming* a common will. A strong case can therefore be made

for the view that wartime technical collaboration can hardly be made to carry over effectively into the peace unless it can be reinforced at some stage by a symbolic act of union—the creation of a “league” or a “federation”—and by some sort of “machinery” for facilitating the achievement (as well as the execution) of a unified will.

The governments collaborating against the Axis should start now to combat the pessimism regarding post-war economic prospects which is so widespread among common people as well as among business and labor leaders. It should be pointed out that, given proper organization and the determination to act in concert, it will be *possible* to have an expanding, developing world economy with jobs for all and with constantly rising standards of living after this war. The destruction of modern war is very great, but so are the recuperative powers of the modern economy, if it can be made to operate at anywhere near full capacity.

Perhaps the prime requisite for reasonably successful political and social and economic adjustments after this war (and hence for a durable peace) is that we have a post-war *expanding* economy. It is possible to maintain an expanding economy. The crucial factor is the rate of real investment, which must be kept sufficiently high. “Real investment” means new factories, new highways, new housing, new capital equipment generally. What is “sufficiently high” depends upon the habits of the community as to savings and consumption. If automatic market forces after this war do not keep *private* real investment up to the level necessary for stability at reasonably full employment—and it is unlikely that we can count on this—then public agencies (national and supra-national) must not hesitate to take vigorous action. Defense programs in all the leading countries have shown the people that governments can bring full employment by “investing” enough in destructive equipment. It is unlikely that public opinion after this war will accept the view that it is impossible to accomplish the same



thing in peacetime by more constructive means, such as subsidized housing, the planned industrialization of new regions, and deliberate efforts to increase consumption through shorter hours, social security benefits, improvement of nutrition, and the like. Here, then, is the main economic task of the post-war period. On the test of success or failure in accomplishing this task may hang the fate not only of collaboration among "United Nations" for winning the peace, but the fate of democratic regimes as well.

### MAP OF THE FUTURE <sup>16</sup>

I have no brief to speak for anyone except myself, but I believe that the majority of geographers would agree that reconstruction ought to be based on the following broad principles:

1) Present cultural units should be preserved with the utmost care and should have full autonomy in all local affairs. This means that a country such as Switzerland, Holland or Hungary should be preserved intact with its present boundaries, unless the people themselves in compact geographical blocks desire a change. If some country, such as Belgium, is troubled by friction between two sections with different cultural systems, each of these, if it so desires, should be given autonomy. The decision should rest with the individual cultural groups. Autonomy . . . does not mean complete independence. The day for completely independent small political units has passed. Nevertheless, units that are far too small to stand independently will presumably be most contented if they have a degree of self-government far greater than that enjoyed by the States in the United States.

2) In remaking the map of the world there should be the least possible interference with old and well established political as well as cultural units. In other words, in the case of a

<sup>16</sup> By Professor Ellsworth Huntington, Yale University. *Time*. 40:3-4, 6. August 3, 1942.

country such as Belgium, the effort should be to encourage the Walloons and Flemings to cooperate as fully as possible within old boundaries with such minor changes in local autonomy as may be mutually agreed upon. This principle, of course, must be interpreted in the light of the first principle and also of those that follow. Unless there is some strongly impelling reason to the contrary, old cultural units should be preserved more carefully than old political units. This will be much facilitated if the remaining principles are intelligently applied.

3) The third principle is that smaller cultural and political units, together with large ones in some instances, should be combined into economic units large enough and powerful enough to stand on their own feet and to be free from the danger of being swamped by large neighbors. The United States already forms such a unit. So does the English-speaking part of the British Empire. The same is true of Germany either with or without outlying German-speaking populations such as Austria. On the other hand, in these days of rapid communication, efficient transportation, active trade and increasing power of large mechanized nations to overwhelm small non-mechanized ones in both war and trade, small independent economic units are an anachronism. Practically all small units of this kind would benefit both economically and politically if united into large units while at the same time preserving their own internal autonomy.

4) Political units in the form of large nations, or federations of smaller nations, should coincide as far as possible with natural economic units. This principle is difficult to apply and must frequently be held in abeyance because it conflicts with other principles. For example, Holland normally belongs economically with Germany. The ideal would be that Holland and Germany should each remain perfectly free and completely autonomous in all internal affairs and in many international relations, but that they should form parts of the same economic

unit. Cultural conditions, however, including the prejudices of the present war, may make this undesirable from the standpoint of Holland. Therefore, that country may have to find its place in some other economic unit.

5) The relatively small number of politico-economic units resulting from the application of the preceding principles should form some sort of world federation. The distinguishing feature of such a federation should be complete and absolute power in a few very limited fields, with advisory power beyond those fields. The fields of complete power might include a) final authority over changes in boundaries; b) the administration of colonial regions not yet ready for self-government either by means of mandates or some better method; c) measures for controlling epidemics; and d) an international police force. Advisory powers might well include such matters as steps aimed toward the ultimate establishment of a worldwide international currency, standardization and simplification of the conditions of international trade, and reduction of armaments by mutual agreement until the international police force exceeds the armed forces of any probable combination of nations or federations.

Only the first four principles are directly applicable to the reconstruction of the world map when the passions of war have had time to cool off. The nature of the resulting map, however, will be distinctly different according to whether the fifth principle is accepted or rejected. The necessary adjustments, both economic and political, will be much easier if they are made in the light of an assurance of a world federation with strong although limited powers.

Regardless of whether the fifth principle is accepted or not, a map based on the first four principles will be decidedly different from the one published by Professor Renner. Its construction requires the combined efforts of geographers, in consultation with political scientists, economists, and historians.

THE AMERICAN CHALLENGE<sup>17</sup>

The speech made by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Appleby, at Charlottesville, on July 10th, was the latest in a remarkable cycle of speeches given by leading American statesmen. The Vice President, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Milo-Perkins, Director of the Board of Economic Warfare, and Mr. Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State, spoke in May. In June, Mr. Winant took up the tale at Durham. In July, he was followed by Mr. Claude Wickard, the Secretary of Agriculture, Dean Acheson, the Assistant Secretary of State, and Mr. Appleby. All these men work at the center of public affairs. Their views may be taken to represent official American thought on the problems of post-war reconstruction. There are, of course, great stretches of the canvas which have still to be filled in, but the broad outlines of the picture are there—an impressive picture, drawn in the grand manner, with vision, with confidence, and with hope.

The basic assumption is concerned with the nature of war and peace. War is seen as part of a continuous process whose roots lie deep in poverty, insecurity, starvation and unemployment. A world from which these evils have not been banished is a world in which Hitlers and wars will perpetually recur. In Mr. Wallace's words,

We failed in our job after World War No. 1. We did not know how to go about it to build an enduring world-wide peace. . . . We did not strive wholeheartedly to create a world where there could be freedom from want for all the peoples.

The war will not really be won until the deep causes of war have been rooted up. "Anti-Fascism is not a short-term military job," said Mr. Winant,

it was bred in poverty and unemployment. To crush fascism at its roots, we must crush depression democracy. We must solemnly resolve that in our future order we will not tolerate the economic evils which

<sup>17</sup> *Economist* (London). 143:66-7. July 18, 1942.

breed poverty and war. This is not something that we shelve "for the duration"; it is part of the war. . . .

Here is a new thesis, a far deeper view of social and international responsibility than was ever enunciated at the close of the last war. It goes down to the foundations of society to discover the causes of such surface manifestations of social disease as totalitarian war. Above all, it seeks to put an end to isolationism, not only on the grounds of comradeship and world solidarity, but also in plain self-interest. Economic selfishness breeds war, and war is national disaster.

How is war to be banished? The solution is studied in very broad terms. Its political framework is the will to peace and the continued cooperation of America and Britain. By reason of their power and experience, the English-speaking peoples will play a predominant part, but in no spirit of aggressive domination. The recognition of the "sovereign equality" of nations is maintained against the doctrine of the *Herrenvolk*. As Henry Wallace put it:

No nation will have the God-given right to exploit other nations. Older nations will have the privilege to help younger nations get started on the path to industrialisation, but there must be neither military or economic imperialism.

In unconscious—or conscious—reaction against Wilsonism, the political structure of this cooperative world order is left vague. Mr. Summer Welles clearly envisages a political association no closer than that of Pan America which,

based as it is on sovereign equality, on liberty, on peace and on joint resistance to aggression, constitutes the only example in the world today of a regional federation of free and independent peoples.

None of the speeches goes into very precise details about the "system of general security" envisaged in the Atlantic Charter; but Mr. Welles does give a general outline of the stages of security—a long armistice, the disarmament of the aggressors, a United Nations police force, and finally the United Nations as

the nucleus of a world-organisation of the future to determine the final terms of a just, an honest, and a durable peace to be entered into after the passing of the period of social and economic chaos.

The reason for this rather vague and generalised approach to political and military security springs from the new conception of the deep causes of war. If Hitler is only the puppet of misery and unemployment, it is the economic ills of the people that the new system must primarily put right. All the speeches dwell at much greater length, and in much greater detail, on the side of post-war economic collaboration. And in this sphere, too, there is evidence of an entirely new and dynamic conception of post-war world relations. Underlying it is a great faith in the prodigies of production and science which the "era of the machine and the test-tube" has made possible. The scientific and economic resources which produced the weapons of war can produce in as great a measure the instruments of peace. As Mr. Winant said:

What we want is not complicated. We have enough technical knowledge and organizing ability to respond to this awakening of social conscience. . . . When war is done, the drive for tanks must become a drive for houses. The drive for food to prevent the enemy from starving us must become a drive for food to satisfy the needs of all people in all countries. The drive for physical fitness in the forces must become a drive for bringing death and sickness rates in the whole population down to the lowest possible level. The drive for manpower in war must become a drive for employment to make freedom from want a living reality. The drive for an all-out war effort by the United Nations must become a drive for an all-out peace effort, based on the same co-operation and willingness to sacrifice.

This is the expansive, purporsive concept of economics which underlies the new American outlook, the philosophy of the "new frontier . . . a frontier of limitless expanse," in Mr. Sumner Welles' words, "the frontier of human welfare."

The key is expanding markets, a "mass consumption great enough to use mass production," a future planned "in terms of increase and not curtailment." On this, agreement is absolute.

There remains the vital problem of how these new standards of human consumption and welfare are to be built up, maintained and expanded. The instrument will be industrial capitalism, operating, broadly speaking, under conditions of private enterprise. This does not preclude a measure of government control. Mr. Sumner Welles believes that

given sound national policies directed toward the benefit of the majority, and not of the minority, and real security and equality of opportunity for all, reliance on the ingenuity, initiative and enterprise of our citizens rather than on any form of bureaucratic management will in the future best assure the liberties and promote the material welfare of our people.

Mr. Milo Perkins talks of

a bold and daring use of long-term credits by every enlightened government of the world. Governments must enter fields where private finance cannot enter without assuming risks that are too great to take with other people's money.

In the sphere of agriculture Mr. Wickard does not believe that

the United Nations will conclude a peace which permits unregulated competition for world trade, wildly fluctuating prices and periodic collapses. Rather we may look forward to an equitable sharing of markets, price stabilization and regulation of supplies.

But within some very broad framework of this sort, private enterprise and free trade—the progressive scaling down of trade barriers, and the end of all discriminatory measures—are to be the chief instruments of economic advance.

Let there be no mistake about it. The policy put forward by the American Administration is revolutionary. It is a genuinely new conception of world order. It is an inspiring attempt to restate democracy in terms of the twentieth century situation, and to extend its meaning in the economic and social sphere. The fundamental point about it is that it calls for a cooperative venture, broadly based on the idea of the United Nations. The driving force behind it is to be the resources of

the two most powerful industrial nations in it—the United States and Britain. On their partnership, the whole experiment must to a large extent depend. "If we cannot work with Great Britain," says Mr. Appleby, "with what other equal political entity can we deal?" It is, therefore, quite staggering to realize that not one official word has gone back from this country, to take up, to welcome, to amplify, or to clarify the challenge of these American speeches.

The dangers of this extraordinary silence are obvious. On the purely political plane, it means the passing of all initiative from this country to the United States. The partner becomes the poor relation. The great role of mediator, and bridge with Europe, is lost.

The position is even more dangerous in the sphere of economic organization. The speeches came from the most progressive elements in America. But beside these elements there are thousands of men and hundreds of vested interests who do not in the least accept the thesis of cooperation. The United States is in the position of Britain in the nineteenth century. It can underbid and outsell any other producer in the competitive markets of the world. The business interests are aware of their advantage. Behind Wallace's "Century of the Common Man" stands Henry Luce's "American Century." Behind "the freeing of international trade" lurks "Break the British Monopoly." The great debate on world cooperation is not yet decided in America; and it is as short-sighted as it is tragic for this country to strengthen the forces of economic imperialism in the United States by ignoring the lead given by the Administration. The only schemes for post-war reconstruction that have seen the light in this country during the period covered by the speech cycle are the reports of the Chambers of Commerce, the National Union of Manufacturers and the Federation of British Industries. Let clauses 19 to 24 of the F.B.I. Report be compared with the American statements. The contrast is appalling. Instead



of cooperation for and in an expanding world market the report envisages

a system of barter or at any rate a system of bilateral trade . . . import and export controls, possibly by quota, preferential treatment of the imports of those countries which are prepared to assure us of the means of paying for them, and exchange control.

Dr. Schacht is thrown back at Mr. Welles and Mr. Perkins. The American Administration is answered by those very interests which are most calculated to rouse the imperialist spirit in the ranks of America's own business men. And, if the post-war world is to bring with it fierce economic rivalry between British and American industry, there can be absolutely no question which nation will be the loser.

This is not to deny that large problems and great difficulties exist. It is to plead with every argument of sanity and economic interest that the problems and the difficulties should be dealt with at the level of governmental thought and action, at the level which the American Administration has chosen to make the first advance, and not in the boardrooms and directors' offices of interested bodies on both sides of the Atlantic. The United States has given the lead. Each day's postponement of a concrete and creative reply from the British Government frustrates the hope of a just and lasting peace.

### RECONSTRUCTION<sup>18</sup>

We print below the fourteen "submissions" made by the Federation of British Industries in a Report to the Board of Trade. . . .

1. Whatever the future form of cooperation in policing the world against aggression may be, it is essential that the democracies and other peace-loving nations of the world should take a continuing and permanent interest in ensuring the maintenance

<sup>18</sup> From "Report on Reconstruction," by the Federation of British Industries. *Engineer* (London). 173:470-1. June 5, 1942.

of a sufficient force to curb aggression and that they should be prepared to use that force without hesitation or delay, should the necessity arise. Otherwise any post-war economic structure will be founded on a quicksand.

2. That the gravity of the task lying ahead of us must not be under-estimated, and that every section of our fellow-countrymen must realize that success in that task will depend upon the effort we put forth; it will only be possible to preserve a reasonable standard of life by hard work, and by attaching as much importance to our obligations toward the community as to the rights we claim from it.

3. That to carry out the tasks of reconstruction, continuing international cooperation will be needed. The problems cannot be solved once and for all at any peace conference or by a peace treaty, but need the will and the determination to secure continuing cooperation over a length of years, sufficiently close and elastic to enable methods to be suited to what may well be unforeseen changes in conditions, which are likely to arise from time to time. Cooperation with our allies during the war is the necessary starting point for an eventual wider international collaboration after the war.

4. That the immediate task after the war will be to provide the stricken countries of the world with the first essentials of life and the wherewithal to restore their essential economic machinery; the continuing task will be to recreate the economic systems of the world with a view to achieving world prosperity. The policy of the United Kingdom must be designed to help in the achievement of that objective, and the world systems must be of such a nature as to facilitate the economic prosperity of the United Kingdom.

5. (a) That a common policy between the United Kingdom, the Empire, and the U.S.A. is essential, although the difficulties are fully realized.

(b) That this policy must have for its objective the restoration, in the measure possible, of world prosperity, and

must be such as to facilitate the prosperity of the United Kingdom.

(c) That a system of consultation with the U.S.A. should be created with a view to joint discussions of the means whereby it will be possible to restore prosperity to ourselves and the rest of the world.

Practical cooperation between British and American industry is possible even today, and should be considered by the government and by industry. In spite of war conditions, such discussions hold out great hopes for fruitful cooperation, which, if realized, will be of inestimable benefit in the post-war period.

(d) That a system of consultation with the Dominions, including India, should be devised to permit of a common Empire policy being formulated for discussion with the U.S.A. at the appropriate moment.

(e) That any British Empire-U.S.A. group that may be formed must maintain close touch with Russia and China, with a view to economic cooperation.

(f) That in the consideration of these problems and in the discussion which will arise from them, the cooperation of industrial and other business interests in this country should be sought and utilized to the full.

6. (a) That one of the basic principles of reconstruction is that of increasing world purchasing power.

(b) That in order to obtain a closer equation between the purchasing power of the primary and secondary producing countries a measure of regulation of production, both primary and secondary, may be necessary, but that such control and restriction cannot by itself form a basis for an increase in world prosperity.

(c) That serious attention should be given, both nationally and internationally, to the problem of how far it is possible to facilitate the development of certain of the more undeveloped areas of the world, such as the Colonial Empires of the various countries and China, not so much from the point of view of their being providers of primary products for world use, as from

that of encouraging domestic developments likely to improve their standard of life, or to give them the urge to do so.

7. That the government should forthwith adopt a policy both with regard to taxation and contract prices which would enable adequate reserves to be built up and should further examine in consultation with industry the means by which terminal losses can be dealt with at the appropriate moment. The needs of industry for continuing finance for development in the years after the war require the most careful consideration.

8. That during the immediate post-war period a measure of government control over industry must be retained, to the extent and for the period which proves really necessary. Any suggestion for a more permanent system of the association of government with industry should be fully discussed with industry, and if any such regulation is found justified on economic grounds, it should be carried out by agreement and in collaboration with industry itself. The danger of bureaucratic influence, and of the stifling of individual effort and of private enterprise must be avoided.

9. That industry desires the prosperity of agriculture which is necessary in the national interest, but that the post-war planning of industry, both in regard to home and overseas trade, will be so vitally affected by the agricultural policy followed in this country that it is essential, if industrial policy is to be on a sound basis, that a decision should be arrived at with the least possible delay as to what the future agricultural policy of the country is to be.

10. That most careful consideration should be given to the problem of orderly demobilization, in order to avoid people being thrown on the labor market before it is ready to absorb them. Due regard should, however be paid to the early demobilization of the people necessary to recreate the industrial and commercial machine, both at home and overseas.

11. That industry is prepared to reconsider all the implications of industrial organization, but the government on its side

must define its attitude toward trade associations and pursue a consistent policy toward them.

12. That although it is premature to attempt to arrive at decisions on financial and monetary policy, it is recognized that this is an essential element in reconstruction, both nationally and internationally. Special importance is attached to stability of exchanges and to future financial policy being based primarily upon the interests of industry and commerce.

13. That the power of the home market to consume the products of industry in the post-war period is an essential element in reconstruction. The government should consider how this power can be maintained or developed both as regards consumer goods and capital equipment, and should take industry into the fullest consultation on the problems involved.

14. That consideration of the main problems of policy raised in this report and knowledge of the government's views thereon, in order that industry may have full opportunity of expressing its opinion, are an essential first step in reconstruction, but will have to be followed by consideration of many problems . . . of vital importance to industry.

### COMING WORLD ORDER, CLOSED OR FREE <sup>19</sup>

The men who dominated the United States, Great Britain, and France after the last war rejected the greatest opportunity which men ever had—rejected it blindly and stubbornly in the selfish pursuit of political and class interests. Those who control after this war has been won must do far better. It will be their task to build a strong federation of free nations, not a weak confederation of nations such as the League of Nations was. It was painted to us as a terrible super-state, one which would devour our liberties and eat up our substance. Now we know that the league of the future must be a powerful federation, in

<sup>19</sup> From article by D. F. Fleming, Vanderbilt University. *Journal of Politics*. 4:250-63. May, 1942.

which large powers are given to the federation—powers great enough to enforce the peace over at least the bulk of the earth's surface. If we win this war, we will have another chance to apply our American, democratic methods of world organization. Another chance! The last chance, for if we miss this one the inventors will put such destructive power into the hands of future predatory powers that they will be able to ravage and master the earth itself. This is the last chance that we are ever likely to have to help organize a decent, livable world.

If this war can be won, we must be braced for the most decisive political struggle of our history. Again there will be a let-down. Again a myriad different elements disgruntled by some phase of our war effort will tend to coalesce into an amalgam seeking revenge upon some one. And this time isolationist political leaders whose every act has aided the Hitler war, whether purposely or not, will seek to ride the wave of reaction into power—power that they could hardly avoid using in a Fascist manner. In any event, they would seek again to perpetuate themselves by every appeal to the selfishness and short-sightedness in us. But this time they must not succeed. This time we cannot take "no" for an answer. We must be ready to work as we have never worked before, night and day and every day, for an organization of peace that will enable every people to live and breathe. This time opportunist leaders of reaction cannot be allowed to prevail.

We do not know yet all the plausible arguments they will raise, though it is already clear that they will cry out that we cannot afford to go about the world trying to impose "the four freedoms" on everybody, a thankless and impossible task. Of course, it would be, but do they need to be imposed? The great majority of the nations are eager enough to live their own lives. All that we seek is the guaranteed freedom to do so ourselves. We do not wish to impose any ideology on the Germans and Japanese, but we do wish to break their power to terrorize and enslave the bulk of the human race. When one stops to think

of it, it is both ridiculous and intolerable that these two small fragments of the human race should periodically disrupt the lives of all humanity, bringing death to millions, mortal terror to hundreds of millions, fear and loss to the whole of humanity—all in pursuit of a phantom *lebensraum* for two peoples alone, a living space which could only be based on force and the perpetual repression of others.

It is quite possible that if we alone of all peoples could enjoy the four freedoms while the rest of the world served Germany and Japan we would do so. But today we know that to be impossible. It is only two years back that British and French governments thought they could stand by while Austria and Czechoslovakia and Ethiopia and Spain were strangled to death. Now the British and French know that by conniving at the killing of weaker nations they brought destruction upon their own heads. It is hardly more than two years since the majority of Americans thought that the conquest of small nations was none of their business. How often was that command to "mind our own business" snarled at us during the drifting twenties! But now we know that the game of encircling and looting small nations spreads and spreads. Once begun, in this age of lightning weapons with global range, there is no end to it, short of conquest of the earth itself. After encircling and destroying weaker nations by the dozen, the two encirclers have at length succeeded in encircling themselves with a ring of resolute foes. But the Germans, at least, may still have the power to break out into Africa and the oceans, and if they should succeed then the United States itself would be dangerously encircled.

For the second time in twenty-five years it has been implacably demonstrated to us that on a planet which perpetually shrinks for the purposes of war not even the richest and most comfort-loving nation can be safe unless everybody else is safe. From the welter of blood and looting and destruction which predatory power politics has spread around the earth one and only one international law remains. All other international laws

have been repealed, until we have left only the law that no nation, however big, can be safe unless the smallest of the nations is safe. That is a law from the operation of which no nation can escape.

It follows inexorably that we can only get security for ourselves by helping to establish a world government strong enough to assure to the weakest of nations peaceful access to the markets of every part of the globe. That is the kind of *lebensraum* which is indispensable to the life and freedom of every people, and when we insist upon that we deprive no people of any freedom to which it has any right. But, for that matter, we shall not be depriving the Germans and Japanese of freedom if we insist in the future that they be guaranteed the enjoyment of the ordinary civil liberties of decent human existence.

What are the requisites of the future peace, if the war can be won? As I see it, there are at least five principles which are basic to any tolerable existence in the future for a free American people.

As a first foundation stone of a new world order that will really bring order we must accept the principle that power and responsibility go together. That is one of the few international laws which no nation can evade or destroy. So long as we have one third of all the economic power in the world within our borders we are the decisive factor for world peace. There can be no peace without our full participation in keeping it, and whenever the peace is broken by a great power we shall have to settle the resulting world war. No sanctions, economic or military, can succeed without us, when any great power runs amok. Worse than that none can even be organized. Still worse, none is likely to be attempted without us. The world will be forever out of joint until we play our proportionate part—no more and no less—in keeping it in order. We might as well expect the earth to continue to spin evenly on its axis after the Western Hemisphere had been scooped out into space. If there is anything in which I believe it is that power and responsibility go



together, and that if responsibility is not exercised, power is lost. We are fortunate in having another chance to escape the loss of our whole national position in the world.

If we are to avoid dissipating this second chance to organize the world, while there is time, we must put the fiction of absolute national sovereignty firmly and finally behind us. Science has made it impossible for any people really to be sovereign, except by imposing their sovereignty by force on a world scale. There is no other possible way by which national sovereignty can continue. It is totally impossible for sixty sovereign states to exist on a daily shrinking planet, all asserting the right to judge their own disputes. Only by surrendering that purely theoretical right can the main advantages of living in national states be retained at all.

From this compulsion it follows that there must be a strong federation of nations, operating directly on the people and responsible to the people. In the coming world federation the United States and the British nations must be the leaders, but only the leaders. By carrying the main burden of the war, Russia has settled her place as one of the chief leaders in the coming world order, and other law abiding states will have to be admitted rapidly. The now conquered allies of Britain and Russia cannot be excluded. No free man's conscience would stand for that. The proud peoples of Latin America will demand their place. Exclusion will not work. The indomitable Chinese people have already won their right to share in the world's government. Nor can the people of India long be denied a voice.

The mention of these numerous peoples suggests a fourth principle the power of which has already been too sadly demonstrated, namely that the earth is an economic whole and must be so governed. It is not likely that any important nation will ever open its door to free immigration again. With the exception of certain colonial areas, in which settlement is difficult and

which should be internationally administered, the world is filled up. There are no more land frontiers, though the illimitable frontiers opened up by science are at our very doors. The last acre of free land is taken. As Vice President Wallace one of the wisest men of our time has observed, we must now learn to live together, both inside national boundaries and across them.

This means that international control must make it difficult, if not impossible for any nation to close its markets by prohibitive tariffs, quotas, or other controls. Within a measurably short time men must learn that each high tariff law is a declaration of war and that it will be so regarded and accepted. This is one of the new international laws whose compulsions we cannot evade, especially we Americans whose trade is most vital of all to the economic health of all nations.

Will that mean lower standards of living for us? Perhaps, but economic war as we waged it in the roaring twenties is assuredly the prelude to military war on a scale so gigantic that standards of living must suffer, while scores of billions are spent for weapons that can never have any economic value, however indispensable they may be as police protection for the diminished wealth we have left. We know now that all people must have substantially free access to the markets and raw materials of the earth itself. But who knows whether the drastic limitation of economic war between nations would really do more than curb the profits of some protected industries? As standards of living and buying power increase among hundreds of millions of people abroad, may we not find that our well-being can go up, too, instead of down?

As we are propelled toward the acceptance of a new Roman Empire, or the establishment of a true democracy of free nations, what is to be said of the dynamics of peace? Is it not clear that strong processes to regulate peaceful change must be established, both within and among the nations? If there is an over-riding law by which democracy works, it is the law that

economic democracy must grow out of political democracy or all democracy will be extinguished. We do not have any real choice about reducing the extremes of wealth and poverty within our nation, if we could keep our freedom. We cannot stop the sweep of the Industrial Revolution, but we can democratize its fruits. Indeed we must do so, if industry and autocracy are not to become one. Nor do we have any real choice about setting up strong international institutions—courts, labor and social organizations—to adjust the political and economic stresses and strains between nations. It is axiomatic that unless we provide for peaceful, orderly change we shall get violent change, but axioms save no one unless they are heeded.

Is it utopian to plan a world in which there shall be orderly, peaceful change? Is there hope for anyone in anything less? Those who raise the cry "Utopian!" about our next effort to master the institution of war will have to be brazenly and irrationally bold, as they doubtless will be. But we shall be weak men and women indeed if we are again deterred by such false cries. The Nazis may have been a bit too long-sighted in their eternal insistence that they are establishing their rule for the next thousand years, though they will miss the enslavement of most of humanity for centuries by a very small margin. But if they teach us nothing else, it must be the virtue of looking ahead a little beyond our noses. We cannot determine the whole course of events for eternity. All we can do, perhaps, is to set their direction, but if we aim at less than a century of assured peace what is to be said of our sanity, and of our ability to gauge the forces of destruction which drive us ahead, pell mell? We may not get centuries of peace, but if we fix our eyes again on the fleshpots immediately in front of us, we shall deserve the progressively rapid destruction of our civilization in world wars tumbling on each other's heels, each war infinitely more disastrous than the last.

RECONSTRUCTION <sup>20</sup>

The fourth article of the Atlantic Charter postulates access to the raw materials of the earth on equal terms to all nations. Nothing less than a world-wide mobilization of science and technology is implied because the raw materials themselves are worth little without the technical knowledge and skill demanded in their extraction from the earth and their utilization.

American scientists and engineers have not given nearly so much thought to these scientific and technological implications of the Atlantic Charter as their British colleagues. We have some fine American discussions of post-war economics, but no clear program to indicate the part that science and technology must play in removing the economic causes of war.

The turning point in British thinking came in 1932 when the International Congress for the History of Science was held in London, on which occasion B. Hessen, a Soviet delegate, read a remarkable paper on the social forces that resulted in Newton's formulation of the laws of gravitation. J. D. Bernal, Lancelot Hogben, P. S. Blackett, Hyman Levy, Sir Daniel Hall and other militant English scientists began to discuss the frustration of science and to urge laboratory workers to think of themselves as citizens of the world whose plain duty it was to make their influence felt. Long before their voices were heard H. G. Wells was trenchantly arguing for internationalism.

Out of this agitation came the decision of the British Association for the Advancement of Science to consecrate a whole division to the planned, global application of science to social progress. The American Association for the Advancement of Science followed with a decision to cooperate with the British association in studying what we now call the "impact of science on society."

The British association deserves the thanks of the world for having organized last September an international conference on

<sup>20</sup> By Waldemar Kaempffert, Science Editor. *New York Times*, p. E9. August 30, 1942.

"Science and the World Order" which considered the part that science and technology must play in international affairs. We are still further in its debt for having arranged a conference (July 25-26, 1942) on "Mineral Resources and the Atlantic Charter" under the presidency of Sir Stafford Cripps—a conference that brought us somewhat nearer to a working plan. The resolution adopted crystallized the views of Sir Stafford himself. It envisions, in his words, nothing more or less than the mobilization of "all the knowledge available in the world concerning raw materials and natural resources and also of the techniques of their use."

Centuries before the world was plunged into the most devastating of all wars, and before there was anything like formal science and technology, a few natural philosophers were convinced that knowledge should be pooled for the benefit of mankind. In 1617 Bacon suggested in his *New Atlantis* that men of science should be organized and that a Solomon's House should be created to serve as a clearing center—a proposal revived by Sir Gowland Hopkins in his presidential address of 1933 before the British Association for the Advancement of Science. When Jan Comenius came to England in 1627 he promoted Bacon's proposal in a form of his own.

There is every reason why science should be organized internationally to implement the fourth article of the Atlantic Charter. Science has always been international. Its votaries accept one another for what they know and for what they have achieved. At international scientific meetings no questions are asked about race, nationality or creed. Each man gives freely for the benefit of the world.

How many first-class research men there may be in the world no one knows. The number cannot be far from 200,000, a considerable block of humanity, composed of leaders in thought in every advanced country. They have shown that it is possible for men of exceptional ability to sink their nationalism, their prejudices, their passions in a common cause.

Scientists still stand apart in their internationalism because their objective mode of thinking is not yet the common possession of mankind. If ever we succeed in implementing the fourth article of the Atlantic Charter by granting not only equal access to raw materials but equal access to the technical knowledge by which raw materials are exploited, we shall go far toward removing the intellectual barriers that separate the laboratory from the common mind.

Out of the British conference on international resources of last July two axioms emerged. The first is this: We can no longer afford to leave the use of world resources and of human ingenuity and skill to blind economic and national forces. The alternative to international cooperation is the old chaos.

Planning inevitably leads to the second axiom, which is this: An international Resources Office must be established, an office which will concern itself not only with post-war relief and post-war reconstruction but with the perpetual research and the application of scientific knowledge so that not only actual raw materials (petroleum, coal, metals, plant and forest products) but the techniques whereby these raw materials can be best utilized for the general good of the world may become accessible.

As the meeting in London conceived it, the office would collate all existing information on the amount and the geographical distribution of resources; discover new resources by conducting surveys in undeveloped countries; study extractive and productive techniques; review industrial and agricultural processes; show backward industries in every country how they may become more efficient; revise the patent laws so that objectionable monopolistic practices will be thwarted when they are a menace to international good-will; disseminate technical knowledge and thus do away with much of the secrecy that has held back industry in all countries; promote scientific and industrial research; anticipate changes in industrial and agricultural techniques and thus give fair warning of impending obsolescence of plant machinery and prevent violent fluctuations

in the industrial cycle because of technical innovation; supervise in a general way the selection, training and education of workers; foster research everywhere; break down the barriers that still make it difficult for scientific workers and the public to meet on some common ground.

### LABOR PARTY'S PLAN TO WIN THE PEACE <sup>21</sup>

*An abridged version of the British Labor Party's  
Interim Report on Reconstruction*

What has occurred since September 3, 1939, has left it [the British people] adamant in its resolution to destroy its ruthless enemy, and with it those other governments, European and Asiatic alike, which share its foul purpose. For the grim months that have passed since Hitler embarked upon his self-chosen task of dominating the whole world have made it clear that any peace with him or his associates in infamy would be meaningless.

The British Labor Party will refuse all negotiations with the Hitler Government or those satellite governments with which it is in so ugly an association. It will insist upon the decisive destruction alike of the power of German militarism and those kindred instruments upon which it has relied, both in the East and the West, for the accomplishment of world domination. The Labor Party will, moreover, insist that those who have been responsible for the barbarities which a hundred years will remember with shame shall not escape the punishment their commission involved.

No party is more fully aware than the British Labor Party that this war makes a crisis in our civilization as profound as that of the Reformation and the French Revolution. The first act was the war of 1914; and men hoped when peace came that the lesson of its sufferings had been learned. The hope proved

<sup>21</sup> *Bulletins from Britain*. No. 93:11-13. June 10, 1942.

vain; and this tragedy has swept over mankind because in the years between 1918 and 1939 the forces of privilege refused, where they could, to admit the need for vital change.

They sought to meet the social and economic problems of the twentieth century with ideas which already were obsolete. They refused to recognize that a democratic civilization is incompatible, under the conditions of modern science and technology, with either the parochialism of national sovereignty on the one hand, or the confinement of freedom on the other, to those whose possessions of property gave them, and them alone, access to economic security. That refusal meant a civilization which, for most, was careless of equity and justice. The inequity of the system was plainly demonstrated in the years of the great depression. . . . "Appeasement" almost sacrificed the liberties of the world to those vested interests which had so long been careless either of equity or of justice.

The British Labor Party is bound to lay emphasis upon the period of the inter-war years because its analysis leads to certain important lessons:

1. An unplanned society is unable to maintain a reasonable standard of life for a large number of its citizens.

2. An unplanned society, in which the essential instruments of production are privately owned, is compelled to think overwhelmingly in terms of private profit. In the inter-war years this meant a policy of restriction instead of a policy of expansion. It meant mass unemployment.

3. Because the ability of privately owned capital to earn profit for its owners was the main motive to accumulation and investment, an unplanned society developed a vested interest, on the part of the owners of capital, in maintaining systems which, like those of Hitler and Mussolini, destroyed democracy in the service of German and Italian privilege.

4. The Labor Party is bound, moreover, to note that as soon as the nation became involved in war it became imperative to



plan the national life, and to subordinate private interests to the overriding claim of victory.

Given victory, the approach of the Labor Party to the problems of reconstruction is set by the significance it attaches to these plain lessons. They have validity in the sphere of both national and international relations. Our victory will leave us facing an emergency not less profound than the prospect we have been set by the struggle with Hitlerism.

We must confront that emergency in the spirit which alone makes victory possible, the spirit which [has] recognized that no private interest has the right to set limits to the claims of the nation, that no single nation can pit its claims against the overriding rights of all mankind.

We have, therefore, in the judgment of the Labor Party to set out now, as a deliberate part of our war effort to organize for four things:

1. We have to provide full employment.
2. We have to rebuild a Britain to standards worthy of the men and women who have preserved it.
3. We have to organize social services at a level which secures adequate health, nutrition, and care in old age, for all citizens.
4. We have to provide educational opportunities for all which insure that our cultural heritage is denied to none.

Unless we do these things there will be, after the war, a repetition of mass-unemployment, the re-emergence of distressed areas, a rebuilding of Britain made mean and inadequate by the surrender of public good to private interest. The Labor Party does not believe that the nation will accept peacefully a return to these conditions. They would endanger the whole purpose for which we are fighting.

The Labor Party asks that we register now, as a nation, our recognition that this war has already, socially and economically, effected a revolution in the world as vast, in its ultimate impli-

cations, as that which marked the replacement of feudalism by capitalism. All over the world the evidence is abundant that this revolution has deeply affected men's minds; our central problem is to discover its appropriate institutions, above all, if we can, to discover them by consent. The world is now aware, as the President of the United States has insisted, that the foundations of a strong and healthy democracy have nothing mysterious about them.

"The basic things," he has said, "expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are:

"1. Equality of opportunity for youth and for others.

"2. Jobs for those who can work.

"3. Security for those who need it.

"4. The ending of special privileges for the few.

"5. The preservation of civil liberties for all.

"6. The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living."

The Labor Party accepts these objectives; it observes that, by implication, the British Government accepted them when it indorsed the Atlantic Charter. It agrees with President Roosevelt that "the inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfill these expectations."

It accepts his plea for the necessity of the four essential human freedoms—"freedom of speech and expression, religious freedom, freedom from want, and freedom from fear, everywhere in the world." It agrees with him, also, that "this is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our time and generation."

The Labor Party is bound to remark that the pre-war economic and social system denied these things, not merely to the mass of mankind, but also to the great majority of our own citizens, in this, the second richest nation in the world. It

denied them because they could not be attained by a system in which private profit and not public need was the motive power upon which it rested.

We are able to plan for victory only because we have limited the right of private profit to direct our war effort. If, when hostilities cease, it is allowed to resume its previous authority, it will deny these things once more. In the view of the Labor Party, therefore, we have arrived at a stage where fundamental economic and social transformation must begin.

The Labor Party does not ask for some sudden and overnight transformation of our society. It proposes here only the basis upon which the nation can begin forthwith to build. But the acceptance of this basis entails, at once, certain consequences; for it is clear that there are certain instruments of production without the ownership and control of which by the community no planned production for the ends we seek can be attempted seriously.

The Labor Party therefore urges that the nation must own and operate the essential instruments of production; their power over our lives is too great for them to be left in private hands.

The Labor Party continues to affirm that in all colonial territories the primary object of the administration must be the well-being, education and development of the native inhabitants and their training in every possible way so that they may be able in the shortest possible time to govern themselves. In other words, the interests of those inhabitants are and must remain paramount, and of those interests Parliament is the trustee.

The negation of this policy for which the Party stands is the policy of the color bar, the object and effect of which are to insure by law, administration, and every other available means that the native inhabitant is given a different and subordinate status, civil and social, from that of the European. It is in Africa that the color bar as a "native policy" can be seen in its most undisguised form, but it does, less evilly, but more insidiously, affect British colonial policy in other continents. The

Labor Party is absolutely opposed to the color bar in every shape and form.

The Labor Party is deeply concerned that, in a war for freedom and democracy, a settlement shall be arrived at with India, which enables all its citizens to devote their full energies to the common struggle. It has noted with satisfaction that all Indian parties are united in their condemnation of Hitlerism. The British Government has announced that it will not itself be a bar in the way of Indian self-government, once agreement is reached between the different interests in India. But the Labor Party believes that it is also the duty of the British Government to take every possible step to promote that agreement.

Just as the issues of domestic reconstruction are bound up with our actual ways of waging the war, so international peace very largely depends on the understanding we reach before victory with our allies and above all with the Soviet Union and the United States. The Labor Party regards it as imperative that we should agree with them upon a united strategy in the conduct of the war, and common ends in the making of the peace.

Neither will be possible unless we see that common action is the outcome of common interest, and that their full defense requires common decisions. Our partnership in war can, if properly organized, be the basis of an international experiment from the experience of which a creative peace may emerge.

These are the conditions of the problem as the Labor Party sees them. They involve certain obvious conclusions.

1. Aggressor nations, after military defeat, must be disarmed and kept disarmed.
2. The principle of collective security against aggression must be given its appropriate methods and institutions.
3. The Labor Party expresses the strong view that no principle of collective security, in its full and proper sense, can hope for permanent acceptance unless it is based on the recognition of the interdependence of nations. This will mean the control of

armaments and armed forces by the direct power of the international authority.

4. The Labor Party further emphasizes the importance, in building a new international authority for peace and justice between states, of using to the full the experience in collaboration gained in the various organs of the League of Nations.

5. The Labor Party emphasizes the importance, in the building of peace, of utilizing to the full the special experience of international collaboration which has emerged in this war. Common action for defense; common planning in investment and distribution, for the utilization of raw materials, for the full interchange of scientific knowledge and personnel; all of this has proved fruitful and important.

6. The Labor Party notes with strong approval the declaration in the Atlantic Charter that the peoples of the enemy countries shall, after their defeat, nevertheless share in the prosperity it is sought to organize by the common effort of all nations.

7. The Labor Party recognizes that, as the Axis governments begin to crumble, widespread revolution is certain in the countries they now dominate. It declares its view that each people is entitled to determine its own form of government subject only to its obligation to accept and respect the Four Freedoms and the international implications to which they lead.

8. Finally, the Labor Party is bound to emphasize that the power of democracy in the future to maintain international peace is, in the long run, inseparable from the growth, in each country, of the common ownership of the main instruments of production and their co-ordinated planning for common ends.

## THE WAR OF CIVILIZATION SHOULD FOLLOW THE WAR OF FORCE <sup>22</sup>

Our failure to train leaders of peace as we train leaders of war is responsible for many wars. The people who negotiate

<sup>22</sup> By J. H. Reynolds, President, Hendrix College. *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*. 28:220-4. May, 1942.

peace often have no special preparation for the task. Peace terms are frequently dictated by the victor, and sometimes vengeance is a motive. Nations should definitely train soldiers of peace and civilization. These leaders of civilization should be specialists in organizing peace within the nation and an international order that will foster peace among the nations. The present war grew out of the failure of the peace concluded at the close of the First World War. We have perfected the arts of war; we have failed in the arts of peace. Have we learned the lessons taught by past mistakes? Are we going to repeat the mistakes of 1919 when we write the terms of peace and of international order after this war?

Hitler's ruthless wars are bringing mankind to see that international order is as important to the citizen personally as is his local government. This widening knowledge of mankind is preparing the way for the organization of an effective international order when we lay down our arms. America should begin at once to educate soldiers of peace and of civilization as purposefully and thoroughly as she is training soldiers of force. She should attack as vigorously the problems of permanent national and world peace as she is attacking the problems of winning the war of force.

America is facing and fighting two wars—first, a war of force aimed at the military defeat of the Axis powers; and second, a war of peace aimed at building an efficient national and international order designed to guarantee permanent peace among nations.

We won the First World War of force; we lost the war of peace at its close, a fact responsible for the present conflict. It is easier to win a war of force than to win a war of peace, for success in the latter war requires rich knowledge, patience and tolerance, qualities and attitudes often not found at the close of a great conflict. If the war of civilization is not won, both wars are lost, whatever the verdict in the war of force. The failures to win the wars of peace are responsible for most of the bloody wars of history. Under the stress and excitement of

battles on land, on sea and in the air, we are stimulated to put forth our maximum effort and to throw millions of men and billions of resources into the struggle. If we realize that the battles of peace after the war, both national and international, are as important in saving civilization and in preventing later wars as winning the war itself, the nation would be as ready to attack the problem of training soldiers of peace as she is in training soldiers of force. This is the next step for mankind to take. Are we wise enough to take that step now?

America will emerge from this war the most powerful nation on earth; her voice will be the most potent in the settlement of world problems at its close. Her leaders, now highly honored among nations, will be influential in reorganizing a national and world order. America will wield a powerful influence in winning the war. She should wield an equally large influence in restoring civilization after the war. What kind of a civilization will it be? Each Churchill and Roosevelt has a group studying terms of peace and the structure of world affairs to preserve the peace after the war. Are these civilization builders enlightened?

Although our immediate task is to crush the Axis powers, we must now, if our victory is to be permanent, address ourselves to the task of preparing to win the battle of civilization. Probably the governments of England, America, Russia and China will frame the treaty of peace and outline the world order. Adequate preparation is necessary if we build a permanent peace. For the peace treaty should be brief, allowing for the wisdom of man to fill in and elaborate.

The nation must treat seriously the training of leaders of peace as she now treats the training of soldiers to win the war. America must begin now to train soldiers for the war of civilization. As America is spending billions to win the military conflict, she must spend substantial sums to build a stable civilization after the war. What, concretely, are the steps that America must take now to get ready for this second war?

First, Talent.—America must now through tests discover the best talent among the youth of the nation—young men and women—and she must put them into training centers for building social leaders for the war of peace just as definitely and as well planned as she has assembled in training camps men physically fit for soldiers of force. These centers for training the soldiers of civilization must train the best intellectual and social leaders of history. The nation must take the best talent discovered, whether in the army, the navy or in the secondary schools and colleges, and put them into her civil West Points, that is, her training centers for preparing leaders of civilization.

Second, Training Centers.—Fortunately these civil West Points need not be built like military training camps. The colleges and universities of the nation are ready at hand as agencies to furnish this training. Hundreds of millions of dollars are invested in them. Experience in the training of American leaders for three hundred years places at the disposal of the nation training centers for building a great civilian leadership. In addition, these institutions in their faculties have the most learned scholars of the world. By collaboration between the best brains of the government and the ablest scholars in these institutions there can be worked out a course of study for training competent men and women to guide the nation and the world in a better social and international order. There should also be brought into the staffs some distinguished social leaders whose experience in the world of affairs puts them in position to contribute much to the training of soldiers of civilization. The course of study will include economics, politics, the social sciences, philosophy, ethics, international affairs and modern languages.

Third, Lectures.—The government will make available for special lecturers at these institutions the ablest members of the government as well as the great social thinkers of the nation to inspire the students in these training centers with a large sense of social responsibility and a vision of the problems of govern-



ment, national or international. The best thought of the world, with respect to national and international problems, should be made available in these training centers.

Fourth, Government Aid.—These colleges will require additional financial resources. If the government takes seriously the problem of training soldiers of civilization, it will spend money on these centers. The failure to do this in the past is costing America and the world mammoth sums of money and hundreds of thousands of lives. If we want to end wars and center the energies of mankind on constructive programs of civilization, we must spend money and energy in training leaders of civilization. This training must include complete knowledge of the history of international relations, a full knowledge of the failures of the past responsible for the present and earlier wars, and how national and international affairs can be directed and shaped that we may have peace.

Fifth, Modern Languages.—A basic weakness of America is that her people speak and read only one language. For this task of great social leadership a wise program will include training in one or more of the modern languages so that the men and women who are to work in the interest of peace and order will be able to speak one or more languages other than English.

In a sense, the two wars are one. The winning of both wars is necessary. They are separated in this discussion in order to give emphasis to something which we have not done before, namely, the conscious training of men and women specifically for tasks of peace and civilization after the war. If we neglect this now as in the past it will mean that we will again have to fight future wars. Has this lesson of the failure to prepare for peace been sufficiently learned? Will America, instructed by that experience, present the world with the best trained social leaders that mankind has ever known? In this task we need the most creative minds trained to their highest capacity and possessed of a sense of world responsibility.

Other Nations Involved.—The government through diplomatic channels might take up with Great Britain, Russia and China the question of their adopting a similar program of training leaders for the period of peace after the war.

Civilization is a process of continuing change in response to the growing life of man. Hence any proposed order, national or international, should be flexible and therefore responsive to changes incident to normal growth. Relieved of the threat of war and of heavy military burdens, society may grow more rapidly and the framework of peace may encourage this expanding life.

### JOB FOR AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION <sup>23</sup>

But further, between the relief stage and the stage of stable peace there must intervene an intermediate stage of reconstruction; and this must assuredly be entrusted to some official international body. A considerable number of international experts and advisers will have to be employed by this reconstruction commission. But in addition it is almost certain that in various parts of Europe it will be desirable and indeed necessary to continue some degree of Allied administration during most of the reconstruction period. In Germany, for instance, the Nazis have so radically destroyed all other political organizations that the possibility of finding any organized body of men to whom the government or the administration of the country can be entrusted will be extremely slight. One job of the Allies during the relief and reconstruction periods will be to discover what men and what groups can be trusted and encouraged to participate in the business of government and reconstruction, and to delegate this responsibility progressively as the months go by. With this we pass beyond mere military occupation. The Allied administrators may be in uniform, but their duties will be in

<sup>23</sup> By Julian S. Huxley, English Biologist and Writer; Contributing Editor of the *New Republic*. *New Republic*. 106:366-8. April 27, 1942.

the main civil duties. The problem will not be so acute in Italy, but it must be faced there too.

Besides Germany, the same difficulty of finding a ready-made government and administration may well apply also to those of Germany's victims, like Poland and Greece, in which so many of the best elements have been murdered, and where the population as a whole has been starved and brutalized. Here, too, Allied administrators and experts will be required, though their functions will be rather different.

Finally, all those who have given serious thought to the new world of after the war agree that a much higher degree of international organization is essential—not merely paper organization, as with so much of the constitution of the League of Nations, but functional organization that gets down to definite jobs of international work. The precise form of the organization does not matter. Whatever its nature, it will need men of international outlook and training—for political posts, for colonial administration, for economic controls, for development of backward areas, for health, for agriculture. An international staff is a prime necessity for the world of the future.

We have been accustomed to thinking of international staff in terms of the Secretariat of the League of Nations and its various branches and outgrowths. This is far too modest. To take but one example, the branch staff of the International Labor Office was restricted in each major country or region to one senior official and a couple of typists. In addition, in the post-war world a whole range of new international organizations will be required, for which there was no counterpart prior to 1939. The international staff required by the post-war world will be of a different order of magnitude from what existed before 1939, and for the globe as a whole will certainly run into several thousands. For their training there will be needed an international staff college of the most modern outlook, with numerous branches and divisions.

However, the creation of such a training center will take time. Meanwhile, although there will of course be a considerable number of qualified men of various nationalities available, these can provide no more than the core of the organization. Is it not possible for American higher education to begin making up the deficiency? It is by no means necessary or even desirable that they should all be Americans. The United States contains large numbers of refugees, many of a high standard of professional competence, who need only a modicum of further training to be eminently fitted to serve on an international staff. The United States is the only democratic country in which any large-scale plan of the sort would be possible. In Britain, the shortage of manpower and the earlier calling-up age for service rule it out; China has other fish to fry; and none of the dominions is sufficiently large or pivotal.

Any such training scheme would obviously fall into two distinct sections—a quite general part, at the college level, and a specialized, professional part, at the graduate level. The latter would involve intensive study of the problems of a particular country, in the social and cultural as well as the economic aspects, against the background of a region, such as Europe or Eastern Asia, and this again against a world background.

In regard to the world background the trainees would presumably study such specialized topics as pre-war schemes of commodity control and regional planning, and their possible adaptation to international needs; wartime controls and their possible use for world reconstruction; a broad picture of the world's backward areas and the agencies required for the rapid raising of their standards of life; possibilities of absorbing and moving refugees and other international migrants; techniques of colonial administration; the different types of compulsory and voluntary-service organizations in existence, with the possibility of creating a varied and flexible form of universal service. In addition, they would of course have to know something about the

world background of ideologies, population trends and economics.

In regard to the particular area for which they were destined, they would of course steep themselves in the cultural psychology of the country. In addition, they would have to be made aware of the psychological problems that will be present after the war. Some of these are general problems, such as the demoralizing effect of merely charitable relief. Others will be special, such as the attitude of the French to the Americans and British, or the problem of the Nazi youth, after their idols have crumbled. This, of course, in addition to straightforward studies of the life of the region, in the pre-totalitarian phase as well as in the present.

The courses would also have to be varied in relation to the trainee's speciality. While some would be concentrating on administration, others would be studying to work mainly in the fields of health, education, agriculture, labor relations, and so on.

Such specialized courses should be provided at a few leading universities of the United States. Harvard, the University of Chicago and the University of California at Berkeley would seem to be a minimum. There are other candidates too. Princeton, with the presence of the Institute for Advanced Study and certain sections of the League of Nations staff; Johns Hopkins, with its medical and public-health tradition; a Midwestern state university with a tradition of graduate participation in public affairs (or perhaps the University of Tennessee with its close liaison with the TVA's planning program). But we should beware of too wide a diffusion. A program of this kind will be exacting and will demand a great concentration of research and teaching resources. The government should recognize its importance by releasing experts to take part in it.

Among the colleges, on the other hand, there is every reason for universal and nationwide participation. On the undergraduate level we cannot expect to give specialized training; what we can do is to encourage intelligent awareness of what

the war is really about: the war as a symptom of a social and economic transformation or revolution which we cannot escape, but which can be guided into more totalitarian or more democratic channels; the need for international organization and collaboration; the need for a rethinking of our attitude to economically more backward groups, whether of the same or different color, whether within or without our own boundaries; the inevitability of planning and the possibility of combining this with a democratic way of life; the danger of disguised fascism; the history of the League and the reasons for its failure; and the necessity for American participation in the job of relief, reconstruction and development after the war—but why expatiate further on the opportunities awaiting the educators of this country?

There has been a strong movement in recent years to relate education more closely to the concrete problems of present-day life. At the present moment, by far the most urgent problem of the sort is to make people understand that they cannot expect to go back to what they are accustomed to think of as "the American Way." They have to go forward to quite a new way of life, whether they want to or not. If they can keep it American, in the sense of its being democratic instead of semi-totalitarian in internal affairs, and cooperative instead of imperialist in international affairs, that will be a historical achievement of the first magnitude. To make people understand this is to help materially toward winning the war, as well as toward obtaining a stable peace.

If all the colleges in the United States devote a considerable slice of their energies to helping their students to understand the real meaning of the war, as part of an inevitable world transformation, both social and international, they will have done the best possible general job of war work. Furthermore, if the universities have the wisdom to see that their war work does not end with the specialist training of the chemists, doctors, engineers and so on required for immediate tasks, but also in-

cludes training in international-mindedness and in the techniques of international administration, they will have lifted their war-time function onto a new level of importance. And the two jobs are interlinked, for the college program will have interested tens of thousands of young people in the possibilities of an international staff, and will thus have promoted the flow of candidates after the war into the post-graduate schools of international staff training, which one may hope will be a permanent feature of higher education in this country, and a model which other countries will copy as soon as the relaxation of war pressure allows them to do so.

The task is not simple, but it is one to kindle the latent enthusiasm of educators in a democracy.

#### A WEAK POINT IN THE ATLANTIC CHARTER <sup>24</sup>

The eight points of the Atlantic Charter were welcomed by the world with calm hope; and the peoples of the coalition for liberty gave them immediate support based above all on the unanimous confidence which they justly placed in their eminent chiefs, Winston Churchill and F. D. Roosevelt.

Did these eight points create a psychological, dynamic shock capable of winning over the minds and hearts of the fighters in the free countries, and capable of creating disorder and anxiety among the totalitarian fascists? Let us hope so; it is uncertain.

In the countries where thought and its expression have remained free these eight points must be submitted to close examination, both critical and constructive. Without doubt they constitute the charter of the future. Now we should examine what is already contained in the Wilsonian ideology, the part of that ideology which has been dropped, and why, and that which

<sup>24</sup> By Henry Laugier, former Professor of Science at the Sorbonne, now on faculty of Science at the University of Montreal. *Free World*. 1:368-70. January, 1942.

is new. And we should analyze the modifications introduced, or the new conceptions, and see how they have been improved in the light of the unhappy experience of a League of Nations which should have united world opinion against the aggressor and thus assured collective security.

No doubt others will do this important and useful work. With "the freedom of a soldier who is poor at varnishing the truth," I shall say today only that one of the points of the Atlantic Charter, the third, has brought to the defenders of free institutions, if not a genuine disappointment, at least great uneasiness.

The United States and Great Britain respect the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live.

This principle was clearly included in the Wilsonian ideology. It is therefore not new. It may be affirmed that it was applied with the greatest constancy in the course of the post-war period by the victors of 1918. True they applied it from weakness, indifference, political short-sightedness, and hesitation before the risks that would have been entailed by active intervention in the domestic politics of neighboring countries far more than from genuine devotion to the cause of "the peoples' right to self-determination." But they applied it with perseverance.

They let Italy adopt a Fascist regime; they let Germany adopt a Nazi regime, totalitarian, dictatorial, and conquering. They let Germany and Italy impose upon Spain, against the will of the people, a purely Fascist regime. And it is the full application of this attitude towards the domestic affairs of nations that created all the real possibilities for war today. The risks that would have accompanied the imposition of peremptory vetoes blocking access to power of the authoritarian, bellicose, conquering regimes which were tending toward hegemony are ludicrous compared to those faced today by the combatant democracies. The democracies were then strong, and the totalitarian nations, then emerging, were powerless.



In London, Paris, Geneva, in the corridors or offices of the Quai d'Orsay or the League of Nations Palace, how many times have I not heard representatives of democratic countries oppose any recourse to force, any economic pressure, any energetic propaganda against the totalitarian regimes, against their ideology, and against their methods. How many times have I not heard the terms bellicose, dangerous agitators, employed of those who wished action to be used immediately against action, who declared for energetic steps against the dictator regime! . . .

This paralysis of the democracies was supported by slogans whose disastrous character was then apparent to a few, and today has become evident to all eyes—slogans found in the most authoritative speeches of highly responsible men. . . .

*We shall never start a preventive war*, is one. Meanwhile war had already been prepared, organized, and started in a thousand ways, using the immense means at the disposal of totalitarian economy in peacetime: financial pressure, spying, and propaganda in all countries of the world. . . .

*We shall not carry on an ideologic crusade*, is another. It does not concern us if the Italians are satisfied with a Fascist regime denying all freedom and all spiritual values. It does not concern us if Germans wish to march in goosestep behind a Fuehrer, master of their bodies and minds. No ideologic crusade, they said, and meanwhile the enemy, using tremendous sums and diabolical skill unchained a furious crusade against the spirit of liberty, against popular rule, against the equality of men and races, against all respect for the dignity of the human individual.

*A day won for peace is never won in vain*, is another. Just more words, so often heard, whose tragic vanity events have sufficiently demonstrated.

All the formulas of the democracies, which at bottom were inspired by a spirit of concession, of temporization, and in reality of relinquishment, could in those days take cover under the noble Wilsonian ideology of the right of peoples to choose

their own political regimes; tomorrow, alas, they may refer us to the third point of the Atlantic Charter.

This state of mind the leaders had spread to the most distant and humble representatives of their diplomacy.

In all the world's capitals there was a Nazi ambassador, in all the big towns there was a Nazi consul. These ambassadors and consuls were often, in the strictest legal sense of the term, simple malefactors or veritable gangsters, and generally courageous, forceful individuals with a taste for adventure and peril; they had varied means at their disposal and used them all, honest, dishonest, or criminal, thinking in their hearts: "*The world will be nazified. My mission is to use every possible method to attain that goal.*"

Opposite them in all the world's capitals, and all the big towns, were found ambassadors and consuls of the democratic nations. Generally they were charming men, upright in the fullest sense of the term, sometimes distinguished and cultivated, familiar with Montaigne and Anatole France, with Shelley and Browning, who entertained with grace but who were timid in facing action, hesitant to face the least risk. They backed away in holy horror from propaganda, and said in their hearts: "Assuredly democracy is mild and agreeable; but why try to impose it on others. Moreover it has many defects. Let us guard against any militant intervention in the domestic politics of our hosts! Let us respect the sacred right of peoples to choose for themselves their political regimes in full liberty."

It was in this way that the hard battle for peace was conducted between the Communists, the Fascists, and the representatives of the democracies. And it is from all this that war came.

And will it all start over again?

No, esteemed President Roosevelt, admirable Winston Churchill, heroic chiefs of free peoples,—it is not possible.

The victorious democracies—for win they shall—cannot return to that harmful indifference regarding the domestic regime

of other nations, an indifference hidden under the apparent nobility of an ideology of liberty! In the situation in which science, destroying time and space, places them, the nations of the world are beings of flesh and blood as mutually dependent as the citizens of a town, as solidly bound together as the stars of the Star Spangled Banner. In the name of individual liberty does one permit the building of an explosives factory, a fortified stronghold, a poison-gas reservoir in the center of the city? Is a single star of the Star Spangled Banner allowed to adopt for itself a regime of Fascist structure with a bellicose, conquering ideology?

No, of course not. And so, after victory, shall some nations be allowed to adopt regimes whose natural course is to end in a blood-bath and to precipitate humanity into a catastrophe which will arrest or retard for years, and perhaps centuries, its march towards justice and the goal of common welfare?

No, President Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, when the heroic sacrifices of the children of your great nations, when the efforts and privations of your peoples will have assured victory to the nations with free institutions, these nations will have strength, power over the world's future. You yourselves will then have the heaviest, but also the highest and noblest, responsibilities that men have shouldered throughout history. When peace comes all the immense power of your victorious nations must be used for some time in the countries you liberate or have conquered to establish free institutions founded on popular sovereignty. In the years that will follow peace, during their convalescence, you must help the enfranchised people through an apprenticeship to liberty. In that long period all the economic, financial, military, aerial, and naval power of the victorious nations must support governments founded on respect for the individual, on freedom of conscience, on the people's sovereignty, on the right of all to joyful free work. They must be helped in their first flight, during their growth, and in their difficulties and crises.

Do all within your power to make the world you control democratic. To be sure, we know that the democratic regimes have great defects. Journals published in the interests of Fascist oppression would have revealed them to us had we not seen them ourselves. But what are the scandals of democratic nations, exposed noisily by a free press, brought into the open, compared to the noisome, putrid scandals in the totalitarian regimes? Even with their weaknesses, less than some believe, but certain and known to us, the democratic regimes have two preponderant virtues.

The first is that their free structure and mechanics contain within themselves all the potentialities for recovery, internal reform, and gradual improvement, provided men are animated by civic ideals. And it is the pilots' mission to steer the peoples in their efforts toward a true democracy.

The second is that sovereignty resides in the people, who have a horror of aggression and are resolutely pacific. Keeping the peace is the first requirement for all human progress.

President Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, towards you flows all the devotion of the free peoples engaged in the struggle; towards you are outstretched all the hopes of those who sacrifice themselves, and all the thoughts of the unfortunate, unhappy slaves who groan under oppression. Found the peace on free institutions. Assure the future of the world by an association of governments ruled by the popular will. The failure of democracy was talked of most stupidly when France, the first democracy attacked by all the Nazi power, had to bend the knee. Who shall dare speak of the failure of democracy when America and England, free united peoples, have won and have rid Europe of the indecent beast that dishonors humanity?

In all the countries that you restore or control, build eager dynamic democracies. In the hour of peace be the crusaders of democracy, as you are in the war. Impose liberty on the world. That is what the world awaits from the victory of your noble countries.

DANGERS OF A FALSE PEACE <sup>25</sup>

There are those . . . who see this as no more than a struggle for power between nations. They will look upon any peace as good if it assures in their eyes the supremacy of their own nations in the post-war period. They see Germany, the nation, as the devil in the situation, and will be satisfied with any peace that reduces Germany to a broken or a satellite state. Vansittart in Britain is the prime example of their ilk. He maintains that we shall solve our problems if only we break Germany up into little ineffective states after the war. Let us cut this monster into small pieces, he says, and never again shall it be able to threaten the peace of the nations. To those who are moved by vengeance this sounds like a reasonable end for the people they hate. Actually, however, it can project but two outcomes. First is the end that they think, consciously or subconsciously, it will serve, namely the continuance of their nations in their present positions of superiority. Men find it sweet to belong to peoples that are powerful among the nations, and such men look upon the rise of another state as a kind of impertinence that must be punished, or as a threat that at all costs must be destroyed. When they talk about preserving civilization they mean keeping the *status quo*, and when they appeal to morality they intend to praise a system that keeps them in the place of dominance. They are nationalists of the old order with all the obstinacy and short-sightedness of members of a specially privileged group. The outcome they hope for, therefore, is one in which they will be able to enforce their will upon a world at their feet. Temporarily they may have such a world. What they, in common with all Bourbons cannot grasp, is that such a world cannot last. To dismember Germany is to deny history. She is what she is, and what she is she will be. The triumphs of Bismarck and his successors are too deeply grooved into the flesh and blood of the whole Germany people for any dismemberment of Germany to

<sup>25</sup> By Frank Kingdon, President of the Union for Democratic Action. *Free World*. 3:305-9. September, 1942.

produce anything but a restless and festering discontent. They will rebel at any partition in exactly the same way as any other people would rebel at it. So the second outcome of a policy aimed at perpetuating the old divisions of power would be the creation of an area of permanent discontent in the very heart of Europe.

To affirm this is not to assert that nationalism as we have known it must be continued in the post-war world, but it is to recognize that nationhood as a fact in human experience cannot be ignored. The paradox of the peace in a certain sense is that it both has to recognize nationalism and to disarm it. I try to make the distinction in my own thinking by saying that nationality must survive but that nationalism must not. What I mean is that the social experiences through which men identify themselves with specific groups are not only historically real but culturally dynamic. Occasionally an individual comes along who is able to identify himself with all humanity and to find the full satisfaction of his personality in this wide frame of reference, but such people are rare even among men of genius. Most inspired men find their spark in a local habitation and a home, and in speaking for the particular place they know, express something which belongs to universal experience. Shakespeare was an Englishman, Goethe a German, and Burns a Scotsman. They were men of localities. What in them rose to the level of genius, in most men is the highest inspiration they know. Nationality is one expression of the diversity that gives both character and color to human living. In this sense nationality should be preserved. Outrage is done to actual motivations of the spirit when national bonds are denied. Such dismemberment works violence upon people to such a degree that they will be continuously in revolt against it. Instead, therefore, of a program for the dismemberment of Germany being one that gives promise of peace it is actually only an assurance of continuous war.

The trouble with Vansittart is that he has seen the evil of our times, but he has called it by its wrong name. It is not Germany that has to be dismembered, but nationalism as contrasted with nationality that has to be disarmed. By nationalism I mean the distortion of pride in nationality into a desire to dominate all other nations in the struggle for power. It is nationality turned into a weapon of selfishness, of group advantage over all other groups. As such, nationalism has been the root of many fallacies that have brought our society to its present chaos. National sovereignty, the unlimited right of any people to do what it thinks best for its own advantage, even to the starting of wars, is one. Economic nationalism, that has prevented the free flow of trade through all quarters of the world, is another. Colonization, with its twin evils of ignorance and special privilege, is a third. The whole mischievous theory of strategic boundary lines is a fourth. Just to mention these is to make clear that Germany has followed the evil logic of nationalism with a blinder faith than other nations, but we shall not cure the evil by cutting up its chief exponent. That we can do only by modifying the thing itself.

Evidence for this assertion may be found in the fact that those who fight Germany for nationalistic reasons themselves fall into the snare of the fallacies of Nazism. Vansittart is basically accepting the Nazi philosophy when he advocates dismembering his fallen foe and reducing his victims to the level of chattel slaves. This is exactly what Germany has done to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and France. He is false to his own repugnance of the methods of the Nazis when he adopts them for his own in dealing with the Nazis, yet he is logical if he proceeds on the same premise of nationalism on which they proceed. We are agreed that we cannot build a good peace in a Nazi world. We must recognize that we cannot do any better in any chauvinistically nationalist world, for it amounts to the same thing.

The same tendency of those who think nationalistically to go over to the Nazi philosophy is evident among the group who talk about the Germans being endemically brutal. Brutality is no monopoly of the Germans. To contrast them to their disadvantage with the so-called heirs of the Mediterranean tradition is to overlook the patent fact that Fascism got its start in Italy under a gangster whose record is less bloody than Hitler's only to the extent that his resources were poorer. Hitler went to school to Mussolini, and both found their textbook in Machiavelli. To divide humanity into Germans and non-Germans, with all the virtues on our side, and with evil in the bloodstream of the Germans, is exactly the same kind of mental process that leads the Nazis to divide the world into Jews and non-Jews. A racial theory of that unscientific kind gains no validity because the terms are changed. It is dangerous and stupid prejudice on both sides. The German people are people. They have not been isolated in history. Their blood flows in the veins of every nation in Europe, therefore, to treat them as a "race" apart is false to history, to anthropology, and to good sense. A peace that is founded upon any such nonsense will be as unjust and unproductive as would be a peace based on the inferiority of any other "race."

Nobody could even think in these unrealistic terms unless he had first fallen victim to the virus of nationalism. The question of a good peace comes down to what we can do about this basic poison. How can we preserve the values of nationality yet save ourselves from the evils of nationalism? This looks like a stupendous question. As a matter of fact, it is not as difficult as it seems. This is not the first time that men have had to find a way of reconciling these alternatives. Seven hundred years ago, Switzerland confronted it and brought into being the Confederation that has lasted ever since. We ourselves had to find an answer to the same problem and we produced the United States. Great Britain has had to deal with the demands of her colonies to be recognized as equal partners in the Empire and



has evolved the British Commonwealth of Nations. Each of these unions differs from the others, which shows that not only can the dilemma be solved but that there is more than one way of doing it.

To say that these are not adequate examples because of the homogeneity of the peoples involved, or because of the limitations of territory taken in, is to convict oneself of lack of historical imagination. Switzerland has even overcome the difficulty of diverse languages, for its people speak three different tongues in three different sections. Our own histories have a way of obscuring the bitterness of the events leading up to the Union in their depiction of its glorious attainment. It would do us all good to go back at this stage and remind ourselves of the intense rivalry of the colonies, of their economic warfare, of their threats against each other, and of the trepidation of the smaller ones in the presence of their larger neighbors. Perhaps we have forgotten that Vermont refused at first to come into the Union at all. The Constitutional Convention only just succeeded as it was, and even so strong a Union man as Jefferson would not consent to its conclusions until they were modified by the Bill of Rights. One fact pointed up by the British Commonwealth is that recent warfare does not prevent federal cooperation, for South Africa took her place among the Dominions within a decade of the Boer War.

As for the objection that these instances refer to peoples within relatively restricted areas, we can certainly affirm that modern communications have brought all the nations into closer proximity than that among the thirteen colonies when the Union was formed. They came together because they had the will to do so, a will steeled by the realization expressed in Franklin's familiar phrase that if they did not hang together they would hang separately. Surely it takes no profound philosopher to see that if the nations do not stand together now they will fall together in a civil war of civilization. The federal principle, however it may be implemented, is the proved foundation for an

international structure that conserves national values and curbs nationalistic ambitions.

The central decision which has to be made for such a federation of nations is where sovereignty shall lie. No nation, least of all the most powerful nations, is going to give any promise of accepting a restriction upon its own sovereignty unless it knows exactly where sovereignty will rest and what its own safeguard within that sovereignty shall be. There are three decisive controls that count in this connection. They are the making and administration of the law, the courts of justice, and the army. Who shall legislate international law? Who shall sit on international courts? Who shall command international armies?

When the war ends with the victory of the United Nations, the actual power will be in the hands of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China. If the war continues for a protracted period, the United States is likely to emerge as the dominant one of this group. In the immediate post-war period passions will burn with intense desire for revenge, and the young men who return from the army are likely to be the most inflamed of us all. Is it going to be possible in such a time for us to plan calmly for an international order? I doubt it. I venture to say that a peace quickly made will be one ineptly planned. And a peace ineptly planned, as we have all learned to our dismay, is no peace at all, but an outrider of future wars. Therefore, knowing ourselves as well as we do, we should already rid ourselves of the picture of the kind of peace conference that remains in our minds from the last war. Our first job will be to feed and rehabilitate a broken Europe, and to calm down in the process to the point where we can be as wise in our generation as the framers of the Constitution were in theirs. We have to define the answers to a world society's demand for proper laws, fair justice and adequate policing.

On the legislative side, we shall undoubtedly keep our present national legislatures to continue their work within the national

scenes. Each country should be left free as far as possible to formulate its own statutes and organization. There will, however, have to be an international congress to begin the development of a body of accepted international law. Such a congress will get its representation partly on the basis of the populations of nations and partly on that of the recognition of the parity of states as states. The formula to reconcile these cannot be a simple one. We found one by giving the House of Representatives a population basis and allowing every state equal representation in the Senate. Should the international congress be bicameral this arrangement might be copied. In a unicameral arrangement a formula might be found that provided for a cabinet in which certain nations would be always represented and others by rotation.

The tradition of an international court already exists and its plan could be taken over with few modifications. Our own experience has shown that such a court wins its own prestige by the character and justice of its decisions.

The form of an international army may very well be already in our world by the end of the war, for we shall probably see the emergence of a unified command of some sort among the United Nations. I doubt whether any blueprint could produce as adequate a plan as war itself will force us to adopt. Moreover, the exigencies of war will move us to accept an international command in military affairs.

Events have their own way of educating us. In 1919, we shrank from any form of international commitment lest it involve a loss of sovereignty. Now we know that no commitment in peace means later involvement in war, and that unlimited sovereignty carries the threat of unlimited aggression on the one hand and total danger on the other. Insofar as this has sunk in, we are already prepared for some sort of cooperation among the nations. When it has penetrated deeply enough, we shall seek an actual confederation. When that time comes, the concept of national sovereignty will exercise much less power

over our minds. It will mark the hour at which the door of history will begin to swing on its hinges, for then we shall pass out of the shadows of a past which would dictate a bad peace into the real present in the light of which a good peace can be found.

### WANTED: A PACIFIC CHARTER <sup>28</sup>

Our most urgent need in the Far East, at the present moment, is a clear statement of aims to convince Asia's millions that we actually believe in their right to freedom. Events of recent months have demonstrated that many Asiatics, including Malaysians, Siamese, Indo-Chinese, Burmese, Indonesians, even some Indians and Chinese, refuse to be persuaded that White Imperialism alone is worth fighting for, even against the Japanese.

So far, our "war charters" have consisted of generalities. The eight principles agreed to by President Roosevelt and Premier Churchill last August, and known as the "Atlantic Charter," pledged among other things an "independence" which there has been no serious attempt to implement in Asia. These principles constitute the basis of the only joint statement of the "United Nations" on peace aims—the Declaration of January 2, 1942, in which each of the 26 signatories subscribed to the eight principles, and pledged itself to make no separate peace with the powers against which it was actually at war. The signers also expressed their conviction that "complete victory over their enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as other lands."

Premier Stalin was more specific in his statement of the Soviet Government's war aims. On February 23, he declared that the Red Army was fighting simply a "war of liberation,"

<sup>28</sup> By Harry Paxton Howard, Journalist and Educator. *Common Sense*, 11:242-3. July, 1942.

to "liberate from the German invaders our Soviet territory"—which included not only the Ukraine, Crimea, and White Russia, but "Lithuania and Latvia, Esthonia and Karelia . . . the Red Banners will again victoriously fly over the whole Soviet Land." He wisely abstained from any demand for the disarming of Germany, or the policing of Germany by foreign forces, realizing perhaps that Hitlerism cannot be destroyed unless we can gain the support and sympathy of the anti-Hitler elements in Germany itself, and that this cannot be done so long as Germans believe that the Allies aim at the destruction and dismemberment of Germany.

Stalin, in addition, specifically renounced "racial hatred for other peoples, including the German people." The Red Army, he declared, "has been brought up in a spirit of equality of all peoples and nations, in a spirit of respect for rights of other peoples. The German's racial theory and the practice of racial hatred brought about a situation where all freedom-loving people became enemies of Fascist Germany. The theory of racial equality in the Soviet Union and the practice of respect for the rights of other peoples brought about a situation where all freedom-loving peoples became the friends of the Soviet Union. . . . The Red Army is free from the feeling of racial hatred. It is free from such a degrading feeling because it has been brought up in the spirit of racial equality and respect for the rights of other peoples . . ."

Whatever may be said about the complete lack of democratic freedom in Soviet Russia itself, the assertion of racial equality and opposition to race hatred is a most important fact. Stalin's statement was welcomed by all Asiatics. It laid down a principle essential to any Pacific Charter which is expected to gain the actual adherence of 1,100 million Asiatics—an actual majority of the population of the world. For these yellow and brown peoples, whom we are now asking for indispensable co-operation against Japanese Imperialism, do not accept either the "White Man's Burden" as caroled by Kipling, or the "Aryan

superiority" of Hitler's gangsters; neither are they wholly convinced that it is America's "Manifest Destiny" to dominate and police the world. In fact, they will now co-operate with us only as equals, or as mercenaries who lay down their own terms.

The principle of racial equality is primary to any effective war or peace. In the Pacific Charter now called for, we must set forth clearly objectives to which all liberty-loving Asiatic peoples can subscribe. If we assert the "four freedoms," we must state specifically that they are for all peoples, regardless of race or color—and we must *demonstrate* this in action.

The center of the crisis, at this writing, is China—where we have as yet abandoned voluntarily *none* of our special privileges. (And behind the Chinese crisis are the disasters in Malaysia and Burma, where the Japanese invaders actually got more cooperation than opposition from the natives.) The Chinese military mission sent to the United States by Generalissimo Chiang three months ago to help us to plan and co-ordinate the Far Eastern campaign, was virtually ignored for six weeks. Not a single high-ranking U. S. Army officer even knocked on the door or called on the telephone at the mission's office in Washington. Even when the chief of the Chinese mission issued a statement to the press warning of the possibility of defeat "unless there is a unified strategy covering all theatres of operations," there was no official response. Only at the end of May, when China's demands for support became too urgent to be ignored, were some of the mission "permitted" to sit in on a session of the United Nations High Command.

In May, Secretary Hull presented the Chinese with a "lend-lease" proposal, and on June 2, it was announced that China had accepted. There was no official response, however, to repeated Chinese suggestions that we formulate a Pacific Charter, calling for the emancipation of the peoples of the Far East. Dr. Sun Fo suggested this months ago, at Chungking, and on April 5, urged the Chinese themselves to "assume leadership in the emancipation of the peoples of Asia." Generalissimo Chiang

declared at the end of May, with a polite Chinese prelude: "Our Chinese people are convinced that the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter are not empty diplomatic phraseology. Thus we have the conviction to preach the aims to which the peace-loving peoples are dedicated. In my mind, these principles should be applied not only to America and Europe, but to all peoples and races, so that freedom, justice and equality shall reign throughout the world."

There has been no specific reply from Washington. No responsible government spokesman has declared for the immediate abandonment of our special privileges in China, or of our discrimination against Chinese and other Asiatics in our own country. There has been no real indication that our "superiority complex" (Mme. Chiang recently referred to it as "a cardinal point in the creed of the Western world in its dealings with all things Chinese") has disappeared.

It is time American leaders realize that the Chinese are no longer willing to recognize the old privileges of the Powers. Chinese are no longer prepared to fight for the Nine-Power Treaty, for the "Open Door" for our merchants, manufacturers, and missionaries in China, for the whole Imperialist set-up of extraterritoriality, foreign concessions and settlements, Customs administrative control, foreign warships in Chinese waters and foreign troops on Chinese soil. This whole system of international domination of China has been destroyed by the Japanese in great areas, and the Chinese will not fight to re-establish it. So long as we seemed invincible in our "neutrality," and able to give continued support to the Chinese in war, our position was strong. But no Asiatic statesman, of any nationality, any longer looks up to us—or to the British, Dutch or French—as "invincible" or even "superior." If we want Asiatic allies, we must appeal to them as equals against a common foe, and must treat them as equals.

The White Empire in Asia is gone. We can lose ignobly, fighting for it, or we can win nobly in a war fighting for the

freedom of the peoples of Asia and of the world. We have our choice; we will not have it long.

### SHOULD THERE BE A LONG ARMISTICE <sup>27</sup>

It is not surprising that many persons have eagerly welcomed the proposal that there shall be a long armistice at the end of the war. On its face it is a fetching plan. The last peace, so the argument runs, was written in blind hate, in the spirit of revenge, with war passions still at white heat, when neither statesmen nor peoples were in the proper mood to deal justly and calmly with the problems of the peace. This time we are to avoid all this by prolonging the armistice, some say for two years, some say ten. During that interregnum passions will cool, hate will decrease, the facile human mind will begin to forget and be more ready to forgive. Then the victors will meet and calmly and rationally make final adjustments, reapportioning the whole world. Then an international order which satisfies our conceptions of what is meet and proper will be established, with democracy on top and the Germans forever rendered innocuous, and there will be a lasting peace embracing all mankind.

Plainly it is an attractive picture, especially as it has received its first official sanction in two important speeches by the Under Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, and has been blessed by the *New York Times*. It is attractive for those who do not think deeply because it postpones facing the post-war problems. It is so easy to say, "We don't have to think that mess through now for we'll have plenty of time to do it during the armistice." During the breathing space, Mr. Welles suggests, we of the United Nations will disarm the defeated, police all Europe to protect it from anarchy and private revenges, until the new governments are set up and a world police force is established.

<sup>27</sup> By Oswald Garrison Villard, former Owner and Editor of *The Nation*, *Christian Century*, 59:834-5. July 1, 1942.



To quote him exactly, Mr. Welles wants to establish a world organization and determine the final status of each nation "after the period of social and economic chaos which will come inevitably upon the termination of the present war and after the completion of the gigantic task of relief, of reconstruction and rehabilitation which will confront the United Nations at the time of the armistice." Who can question the good will and the quiet wisdom and sanity of that?

Well, I must. In the first place it seems to me impractical and highly unrealistic. Will that social and economic chaos which Mr. Welles foresees permit the postponement of a determination of the form that the reconstruction of Europe and of the world will take? If that chaos is as grave and terrifying, after the four or five more years of war which Mr. Roosevelt fears are before us, as most trained observers think it will be, can the world continue indefinitely without a plan, a goal, an immediate aim? If we are to wait until Europe is cleaned up and law and order restored everywhere, the "armistice" may last not five years, but ten or fifteen or longer.

It will be a situation that will play admirably into the hands of those who will be masters of the world. They can string it out as long as they wish—provided they can find the troops to hold Europe and Asia down—if they decide that they must thus head off bolshevism as well as anarchy. But the troops will be eager to return home. That we know by experience, for every one of the victorious armies was disintegrating when some of us arrived in England and France in December 1918, en route to the peace conference. In England there was open mutiny when some of the troops were not promptly mustered out, and I had it from General Pershing himself, in March 1919, that his army was dissolving.

Who is to pay the costs of long maintaining garrisons in the conquered countries? Not the defeated this time surely, for they will have been bled white, and so will the victors. We Americans are to feed and clothe the starving millions—a noble

and Christian undertaking—but are we sure that we ourselves will be in a financial position to undertake it? It is true that supplies of food and all sorts of materials are now being accumulated against this day when we are to be the Good Samaritan to others, but who can even guess what will prove adequate to a need that becomes more and more appalling as all the peoples of Europe approach nearer to starvation with each passing day?

Of one thing we may be certain: the unhappy victims of Hitler and his tools alike will have only one over-mastering desire—to know what is ahead of them, what their fate is to be, how soon they can begin to plow and spin and tend made-over machines under their own new governments. I know how terribly the Germans writhed under the complete uncertainty of the last armistice, for I was there at the time. They were like criminals begging for their sentence, however severe, in place of the agonizing suspense. Years of delay for passions to cool will appeal to no one in Europe. As for the business men, they will be among the first to demand an immediate reorganization. Business cannot live by the day or the season. It must know that tranquillity is restored before it can have confidence to go ahead and make commitments for the future, to sell goods to countries overseas. Business men wait to cool off with nothing in sight except interminable men in khaki to keep the peace? That seems to me unthinkable.

### KEYSTONE FOR THE PEACE TREATY <sup>28</sup>

There is one element of peace so important that it deserves to be called the keynote for a sound treaty. This involves the relation of education to warfare and to peace.

Education generally in the past has been prostituted to lay the foundations for misunderstanding, hatred and eventual war-

<sup>28</sup> From article by John K. Norton, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. *Nation's Business*, 29:51-2. March, 1942.

fare between nations. Even before the dictators arose this was true.

This situation should be resolutely corrected after this war. As a keystone for the peace treaty, I propose that education be made an instrument for preventing, rather than one for causing, wars.

Accordingly, the first and most important point of the peace treaty should read something like the following:

"We, the high contracting nations, do pledge our sacred honor that education henceforth in all of its aspects and at all levels, whether concerned with children, youths or adults, will at all times be conducted in a manner:

"1. To promote understanding and good will rather than misunderstanding and hatred among the peoples and nations of the world.

"2. To make all our citizens understand that warfare is not a glorious and noble undertaking but a barbarous, costly, indecisive and obsolete method of settling international disputes and problems.

"3. To make known and to popularize the methods that are available to settle international questions.

"We, furthermore, pledge our sacred honor that we will vigorously and fully support the work of the World Board of Education in its work in our country and in all other countries."

The World Board of Education should be provided for in the peace treaty as an independent agency for implementing the clauses of the peace treaty affecting education. The board should be composed of one representative from each nation, regardless of size (Denmark might well furnish as able a representative as the United States). Members should serve for ten years, one fifth of the membership to be replaced every two years.

The duties of the World Board of Education should be:

1. To prepare textbooks and other teaching materials in all languages to implement the educational clauses of the treaty.

(These textbooks should point out that prosperity and a high standard of living for all peoples lie along the road of science, knowledge, training and international cooperation rather than in the swamps of warfare which destroy man's chances for economic well being. They should contain material based on anthropology and other scientific fields that reveal the fraudulent nature of the doctrine that any people or race is inherently superior to other peoples or races.)

2. To examine the textbooks and other teaching materials of all nations and to make annual reports as to which nations are most and least effectively observing the educational clauses of the treaty.

3. To conduct examinations from time to time of the children and citizens of all nations to discover their attitudes toward other nations and to report upon the findings of these examinations. (Here would be an opportunity to apply objective testing methods and opinion poll technics to something that is really important.)

4. To organize great international educational conventions whereby educators and leading laymen may regularly appraise progress made in making education an effective instrument in carrying out the educational clauses of the treaty.

5. To conduct research, issue reports and to carry on any other activities designed to promote the ends for which the board exists.

The work of the World Board of Education should be financed through an endowment established at the time of its creation, contributed to by all nations proportionately on the basis of population and wealth. Gifts and grants from philanthropic individuals and foundations should be accepted.

The same arrangements for the enforcement of the educational provisions of the treaty and for the support of the World Board of Education should be used as for the enforcement of provisions set up for other sections of the treaty.

The support of such a proposal would involve no diminution of the energy and vigor with which victory will be pursued. In fact, the proposal may properly be looked upon as one specific implementation of the spirit of the Atlantic Charter. As such it would add to, rather than subtract from, the morale of the nations now at war with the totalitarian regimes.

### WORLD FEDERATION <sup>29</sup>

From every point of view . . . it is high time for the Roosevelts and the Willkies and other enthusiasts to give a definiteness of content to talk about the future which is not to be found in glib generalities like the Atlantic Charter or the Four Freedoms, as the latter are interpreted in India or even in Washington.

The case for the right sort of world cooperation has long been very strong. This war makes it stronger and more obvious. The answer to total war is, or ought to be, total peace organized on a world-wide scale. Trade neither in things nor in ideas can be confined to nations, continents or even hemispheres. The continuing discontent or smouldering resentment of exploited races, nations or classes will menace the peace of all mankind. The social planning necessary to conquer poverty and insecurity must take account of nations as well as social groups within nations. World organization of the right sort is therefore desirable, but whether we can get it is by no means certain. The whole problem requires the closest study—not only of what is desirable but of what is possible.

The soundest principle is federation. But those optimists who loudly insist that our American union of states has been so successful that the world can and should simply copy it, do their cause a great harm. I doubt if there are 10 Americans who, faced with actuality, would give to any central government of a world where the United States has less than 7 per cent of

<sup>29</sup> From article by Norman Thomas, repeatedly Socialist candidate for President of the United States. *Call*, 7:3. September 11, 1942.

the total population anything like such power as the government at Washington has over the people of Rhode Island or Iowa or New York. . . .

Under actual circumstances, no centralized world government, federal or non-federal, is now possible, except perhaps as a dictatorship of a strong military power. Two or three strong powers would soon fall to fighting for supremacy. Even if possible, such government would not be desirable. It would not so much conquer war as make wars civil rather than foreign. And civil wars are the worst of all. Clearly the only chance there is for world federation after the war is on the basis of bold and imaginative but careful consideration of the minimum rather than the maximum powers which must be assigned to world organization for the sake of delivering us from the curse of a third world war in less than a generation.

This war has established the fact that the world climate, both military and economic, is fatal to the continued existence of little nations each claiming absolute sovereignty. That was not true before 1914, and many of the little nations have made contributions to civilization which we do not want to lose. However, Hitler's effort to force the small nations of Europe into his kind of new order has tended further to identify their nationalism with freedom. Therefore the small nations more than ever will want to maintain their independent life.

But the practical difficulties, even if the dominant powers are Russia, Great Britain and America rather than Germany and Japan, will be enormously great. The only possible answer in Europe is a closely knit federation or federations. Logically there ought to be a United States of all Europe west of the Russian boundaries. The difficulty is the widespread fear that such a Europe would be dominated by the numerous and well disciplined Germans who would hold the central position in it. Hence it is probable that there may have to be several regional federations within the European continent. It is these federations, and not a jumble of nations big and little, which should

be federated with other regional groupings in some sort of organization for preserving peace. In it the United States should play a part.

How much power should this world federation have? How should it be organized and how governed? These are questions still unanswered, to which the right answer, found and adopted by the United Nations or any considerable number of them, might greatly shorten the war and make the eventual peace infinitely more secure. Men might have something worth fighting for.

There is a growing disposition in important circles, official and unofficial, to say that the answer must be found by development during an armistice which may last for years before a definite peace is signed. During these years various international agencies set up by the victor nations will not only police the world but try to rehabilitate it. Out of their work, aided by the healing hand of time, will come the more definite form of peace. Perhaps the most persuasive single statement of this theory is to be found in a book by an Englishman, E. H. Carr, entitled *Conditions of Peace*.

Because Mr. Carr has written a brilliant analysis of the world revolution in politics and economics, and because he argues persuasively against vindictive treatment of the whole German people, a good many American liberals have uncritically swallowed this theory of the gradual working out of the new order, especially in Europe, after the Axis has been soundly defeated. What his plan really presupposes is a British government, aided somewhat vaguely by the American and the Russian governments, miraculously endowed with God-like attributes of disinterested power and wisdom—of which they have shown no signs in their past history or in their present performance and which certainly are not the automatic consequences of intoxicating victory after a desperate war.

As a matter of sober fact the attempt of the United Nations to exercise this power without previous solemn commitments to a

sound basic plan of organization would mean steadily mounting rivalries between them, steadily increasing irritations of the people whom they police, and an impossible strain upon whatever is left of democracy in their governments at home. It is perfectly true that a good peace will take account of the need for growth. Under proper conditions, international agencies for relief and rehabilitation and the supervision of plebiscites may be factors in shaping the new world structure. But this depends on the prompt adoption of a basic plan which will give assurance to the peoples of the world that cooperation will be genuine and that federation will not be a camouflage for world domination by the English speaking peoples, the white race or the victor nations.

At best, no world federation can spell utopia. It ought to pledge its members against persecution of minorities and create conditions and inspire ideals which will make possible the universal growth of more freedoms than Mr. Roosevelt has enumerated. But it cannot guarantee by force a universal bill of rights. The attempt would be meaningless except as a standing invitation to new war.

The business of world federation, initially, will be more modest. Based on a principle of cooperation of peoples without vengeance and without imperialism, it will provide for them economic opportunity and so lessen the temptation to war. It will provide a machinery for avoiding seething disputes and armed aggression. That certainly requires an end of aggressive and competitive armaments. I think that, under present conditions, it will require some kind of international police force on a quota system. . . .

Mr. Roosevelt, who did not hesitate to take the initiative in the Atlantic Charter, has a solemn responsibility to do a better job. In his own country he could get help if he and Congress would set up advisory post-war planning boards to consider not only our internal structure, political and economic, but also the kind of world cooperation which will be worth our support. The time for this sort of action is now!



## EXCERPTS

The Atlantic Charter gets its name from the fact that it was signed at sea and not because it applies only to nations bordering on the Atlantic, as some persons mistakenly think. This is an important point to clear up because it has been used against the United Nations by Axis propagandists.—*Charter Day—Aug. 14, '42. mim. p. 2.*

- We of the United Nations are agreed on certain broad principles in the kind of peace we seek. The Atlantic Charter applies not only to the parts of the world that border the Atlantic but to the whole world; disarmament of aggressors, self-determination of nations and peoples, and the four freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear—*President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Radio address, Feb. 23, '42.*

. . . *Creative peace plans* have been expressed by George Fox, Sully, (Grand Design of Henry IV), William Penn (Plan for the Peace of Europe), Wilson (Fourteen Points and the League of Nations), Kingdon (prize essay on "The Price of Peace"), Streit (Union Now), and others. The peacemakers include all those who see that peace is not "made" except by those who are dedicated to *living creatively*, by the method of reason as against violence, toward the goal of *world welfare*; so *creating* a world community, embodying order, law, justice, and peace. "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."—*Martin H. Neumeyer, University of Southern California. Sociology and Social Research. Mr.-Ap. '42. p.306.*

Those who demand to know exactly what we are fighting for and what sort of a future we face must first learn why we are fighting. Our war aims spring full-formed out of the nature of the war itself. But they cannot be perceived except

by those who understand why the war happened. Thus we face a gigantic task in self-education; one which must be carried on now, during the stress and strain of war. The difficulty of the undertaking is all the greater because much of the teaching of the past twenty-five years must be unlearned. But the task has to be accomplished if we really want peace in the future. It is not a job for government agencies. It is truly a job of self-education which citizens have to undertake for themselves, education whose results will determine their future thoughts and actions and consequently the course that their government will follow.—*William Agar, Educational Director, Freedom House. Commonweal. Jl. 24, '42. p. 324.*

Much is being said today about a new world order to take the place of the old world order when the war is at an end. If that new order is not already on its way before the war is over, we may look for it in vain. A new world order cannot be worked out, at some given moment, and reduced to writing at a conference table. It is born, not made. It is something that lives and breathes; something that needs to be worked out and prepared in the minds and the hearts of men. It expresses itself in brotherhood, in goodwill, and in mutual aid. It is the application, in all human relations, of the principle of service and of helpfulness.

While the old order is destroying itself, a new relationship of men and of nations is already beginning its slow but sure evolution. Its aim is brotherhood, its method cooperation."—*William L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada. Agricultural Missions Notes. Ap. '42. p. 1.*

. . . On paper this ["cooling-off" period after the armistice, before peace terms are signed] looks like an admirable scheme. Sumner Welles and Hull back it, Messrs. Hoover and Gibson accept it, Mr. Landon has endorsed the Hoover-Gibson book and Mr Willkie will certainly go along. That seems to make it

unanimous. But actually nothing is more unlikely. The catch is the connection between the new international and domestic issues. Mixing a metaphor, the cooling-off period is going to fall into hot water. Why? Well, Ralph Robey, who reflects the view of the powerful business community, gives the answer in a recent *Newsweek*. He vehemently rejects the plan. It would mean, he says, that instead of returning straightway to business normality, the government would continue for three years or more to control business and industry; price ceilings, wage fixing, rationing, "bureaucratic snooping," high taxes, would all continue. The New Deal planners would "start planning for the world." Here is another slogan; in fact the catch phrases of the new struggle are being coined every day.—*Richard Lee Strout, Washington Correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor. New Republic. Jl. 13, '42. p. 48.*

In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear, which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—everywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millenium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation.—*President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Message to Congress, January 7, 1941.*

Enactment of the Lease-Lend Bill, March 11, 1941, again committed this nation to defeat of resurgent German might. Franklin D. Roosevelt, determined to profit by his predecessor's mistakes, won Congressional authorization to arrange whatever repayment conditions he deemed best. He had three basic conditions clearly in mind. One would get from Lend-Lease recipients, now, a promise of forbearance toward the beaten foe of the future. Another would pledge to victor and vanquished alike equal access to the world's raw materials and trade. A third would defer the victors' disarmament only until the aggressors' reform was assured.

To Mr. Roosevelt, the 21 American republics afforded a working, if imperfect, model for the system he had in mind. From Costa Rica's pure democracy to the Dominican Republic's dictatorship, their political forms reflected the variety in the rest of the world. Many others were dictatorships, but their relations with one another represented international democracy for the most part faithfully practiced through recognition of one another's political equality, reciprocal trade, and arbitration of disputes.

The mounting Lease-Lend billions primarily would uphold the British and Chinese against immediate attack on us and them. But some of those billions, Mr. Roosevelt decided, should go to strengthen the inter-American system and be used as a stake in the game for erection of a comparable, worldwide system after the war.—*Newsweek*. Je. 15, '42. p. 27.

A Joint Declaration by the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa, Yugoslavia.

The Governments signatory hereto,

Having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Joint Declaration of the President

of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter; and

Being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, and that they are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world, *Declare*:

1. Each Government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such Government is at war.

2. Each Government pledges itself to cooperate with the Governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

The foregoing declaration may be adhered to by other nations which are, or which may be, rendering material assistance and contributions in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism.

Done at Washington, January First, 1942. —*United Nations Joint Declaration. Department of State Bulletin. Ja. 3, '42. p. 3.*

We welcome all the signs of Congressional action bearing on a better world order. As far as they go, we support bills like those of Representative Jerry Voorhis (H.J.R. 291) concerning economic post-war planning and of Senator Elbert H. Thomas (S.110) establishing a Foreign Relations subcommittee to "study all matters pertaining to the establishment of permanent and lasting peace."

Representative John Vorys of Ohio urged on June 25 (p. A2594 of the *Congressional Record*) the re-invigoration of the Interparliamentary Union. Conceding that the Union has fallen into "innocuous desuetude," he declared:

We should oil it up and streamline it rather than scrap it. The immediate conduct of the war should, of course, be left as it is, but we know from past experience that there is danger that war aims and peace plans dictated solely by military and diplomatic forces will not be effective. In the long run, any international organization, formal or informal, temporary or permanent, must have the support of the people in the democracies. This means that the people through their elected representatives must assume their responsibility in formulating and discussing such plans. The Interparliamentary Union is a mechanism for doing this which is now in existence. Why not put it to work?

—*World Federation—Now. Ag. '42. p. 2.*

The Women's Division of the Methodist Commission on World Citizenship recently recommended to 106 Conference Secretaries throughout the United States the following step:

That the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States be urged to set up a Congressional Peace Aims Commission for the formulation of such peace aims as the nation deems feasible for the conclusion of this world conflict, publicizing them to all nations, allied, neutral, and enemy nations alike. Such a step would be a means of bringing new hope of freedom and security to Axis and allied peoples alike and thereby speed the satisfactory conclusion of the war.

The annual meeting of the Women's International League in May and the annual conference of the War Resisters' League in June endorsed establishment of a Congressional Peace Aims Commission.

In our April issue we urged a Congressional Peace Aims Commission to internationalize the discussion of peace aims and terms and to submit a final draft (revised in the light of worthwhile suggestions from other nations) to a two-thirds vote of the Senate in order to convince people abroad that we mean what we say.—*World Federation—Now. Ag. '42. p. 2.*

Postponement of territorial questions does not, of course, imply that nothing definite need be done yet about the Peace Conference. On the contrary, it is our contention that a definite commitment by President Roosevelt to insist on the free

and unhampered representation of all peoples in the Peace Conference—belligerent, non-belligerent or neutral—would be worth more now to future peace than any possible unofficial peace aims. We are petitioning him to make such a pledge.

Since the coming peace will affect all peoples, we cannot claim to uphold democracy if we are not ready to let them all participate in formulating its provisions. What else is democracy in the international field? The native Javanese, Malaysians and Icelanders should have as much to say about the peace provisions affecting their homelands as any group of British and Americans. We shall need to encourage the better elements of the enemy nations to bring their problems to the peace table, too, for, if we mean to establish lasting peace, we must gain the consent of the governed to the rule of world government.—*World Federation—Now*. Ag. '42. p. 2.

Federal Union, Inc., assembled in its Second Annual Convention proposed and accepted the following resolution:

1. That the people of the United States, acting through their government, set up machinery for urgent consideration of how the principles of federal union, as exemplified in the Constitution and in other federal governments, might best be applied internationally now to win this war and secure enduring peace, a better standard of living, greater justice and more individual freedom.
2. That such consideration should comprehend:
  - a. The full application of federal principles to a nucleus composed of such nations as are found ready and able to undertake this step with greatest hope of success.
  - b. The partial application of federal principles to an all-inclusive world organization, beginning with all the United Nations as a nucleus.
  - c. The preparation of draft constitutions designed to achieve both these objectives.

3. That the machinery for this action might be provided, for example, in some such ways as either or both of the following suggestions:

- a. That the United States Government invite both its neighbors, Canada and the United States of Mexico, both of which are Federal Unions, to form with it a New World Committee of Three for the purpose of organizing a broader Expert Commission on International Federal Union. To make the most of the world's available experience in this field, the members of this commission should be drawn from the peoples that have actually governed themselves by federal union. All the members of this Commission would sit as private citizens, and none could represent any government. The Commission would submit its report and its draft constitutions to the New World Committee for transmission to all concerned with a view to action.
- b. That the United States Government invite the members of the existing Inter parliamentary Union to hold an emergency session in the United States to consider this whole problem, and particularly its bearing on the maintenance of the institutions of free, representative government.—*Federal Union. 2nd Annual Convention.*

*St. Louis, Missouri June 26-28, 1942*

And finally, League or Union? Here I feel still more cautious but I shall throw out a few ideas for what they are worth. I began my reading with a strong feeling that the League had hopelessly failed and that some kind of World Union was a better way out. The more I have read the more I have found myself swinging toward something based on the League. With all its timidities (which our own Congress can often imitate) and its defects, its record of unspectacular achievement is much more impressive than I had realized. The so-



called technical services in particular—health, labor, etc.—must not be abandoned. Perhaps they could be merely transferred to Streit's Union but there is more to it than that.

In the first place it is not fair to balance against a League with bad failures a Union with no failures. The Union never existed. We do not know what it would do. My guess is that Streit's Congress might have hesitated about sanctions against Italians in 1935 as much as the Council did and, lacking an international police, have applied them no better. I also surmise that the elected representatives from Italy or Germany in a Congress would have been *alter egos* of Mussolini and Hitler as much as their appointed delegates to Council or Assembly. A dictator can control elections easily, at least if there is no effective federal supervision—and would such supervision have been likely?

Next, the League is a going concern, or at worst was such until Munich. We have something to start from; we know the weak points that must be remedied; the strong points have been operating for two decades. We should be rather slow to junk the League for something entirely new.

The failures of the League were not necessarily the result of its structure. It was hampered by causes which may not be repeated. There was its entanglement with a dictated peace—this time we may negotiate, especially if the dictators have been replaced by democratic governments. Then the strains put on the League by events were terrific. Would the United States have survived if the Dred Scott case, secession, the recent depression and several state dictators like Huey Long had all come within two decades after 1789. The League was obliged to go through all that. Our Union had sixty years to become rooted before the first great strain of 1850. Finally, the League may not have worked because its members did not want very much to make it work.—*Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Professor, Harvard Law School. American Scholar. [Jl.] '42. p.287-8.*

Within the framework of the Atlantic Charter and the Anglo-American and the Sino-American Mutual Aid Agreements of February and May 1942, a dim outline of a new international commonwealth is being sketched which is both supranational and supraregional.

The newly concluded Mutual Air Agreement between China and the United States is the first important document concerning Chinese post-war policies. Being a literal copy of the Anglo-American agreement of February 23, 1942—with the exception that everywhere the words "the Republic of China" are substituted for "the United Kingdom"—it constitutes proof that among responsible statesmen of China and the United States there is no doubt as to the equality of all the United Nations. With its reference to the Atlantic Charter, both China and the United States reaffirm the global character of this statement of the United Nations' war aims. Beyond that, however, the new agreement would seem to chart a very definite course of Chinese, American and British post-war policies.

In this respect, the most important provision of the new agreement is contained in Article VII, which deals with the repayment of American lend-lease advances to China, in excess of those amounts which would be repaid by Chinese goods and services or cancelled by the return of lend-lease articles. In plain words, the United States recognizes that repayments "shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries." The United States thereby forestalls any revival, after the Second World War, of the acrimonious discussions of the 'twenties as to how much of their war debts former Allies ought to repay in terms of the original debt rather than in terms of their reasonable capacity to meet their obligations.

All three [Britain, China and the United States] have now acknowledged the international interdependence of nations and the need for international cooperation on a scale much broader than pre-war concepts of national independence and national sovereignty were generally taken to imply. Moreover, all three

nations have now explicitly bound themselves to shun discriminatory treatment in international commerce, to reduce their tariffs to the minimum still compatible with the expansion of international trade, and to limit other trade barriers.—Kurt Bloch, *Associate Editor, Far Eastern Survey*. JI. 15, '42. p. 135-7.

Because of the increase in the understanding of the nature of this war, the interest in the plans for the future has also immensely increased. Never before in history has such a large number of ordinary citizens participated in discussing the future world organization. Remarkable discussions are going on everywhere in this country, and there is almost no meeting in which the question of the future is not brought up in some way. Huge farmer meetings, like those of the National Farm Institute, are dedicating a part of their sessions to the consideration of these subjects. Important labor groups are expressing their interest in the United Nations which is the first step towards the new democratic world order.

A great many universities are devoting much of their time to this subject and special groups like the National Planning Association and the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace have published some remarkable studies on the same theme. At the recent annual session of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, a large number of delegates participated for two days in an extremely interesting examination of the subject, *Winning Both the War and the Peace*. The noteworthy fact about this meeting is that hundreds of delegates—official representatives of states, universities, labor unions, and religious societies—came from all over the country to take part in this discussion.

The United Nations idea is rapidly becoming an inspiring ideal to the American people. It is this idea which gives assurance to everyone that it is not only a just war—but also a war for world organization which will establish the welfare and security of all nations. In England, the discussion is constantly gaining ground. In the U.S.S.R. and in China, the humanitarian mission of these countries, the duty of freeing all peoples

from the Fascist yoke and of organizing for world collaboration are constantly underlined. In the occupied countries themselves, the promise, not only of freedom from the invader, but also the promise of a democratic world order, are an important part of the propaganda of the different movements of resistance. And finally in Latin America, the supporters of the United Nations are making of the vision of a future democratic world organization one of the great weapons in the struggle against the well-financed fascist groups.—*Louis Dolivet, Secretary-General of the International Free World Association. Free World. My. '42. p. 326-7.*

Encouragement comes [also] from the fact that collaboration among many members of the United Nations, despite the absence of a central government over them, is now so intimate and affects so many aspects of their political and economic life that a sudden snap-back to pre-war conditions of relative autonomy would be well nigh impossible. Their ways and modes of living are being so drastically revamped and made so mutually dependent that the wartime ties could not be severed without a general collapse. Officials in the United Nations governments are accustomed to dealing personally with one another; these innumerable informal contacts across national lines are helping to eliminate suspicion. The process of collaboration, however, is by no means smooth. Mistrust, jealousies and rivalries among officials and states inevitably arise, and enormous obstacles have to be overcome.

It should also be noted that a large number of American administrative officials and experts are being trained in international affairs. They are learning, through actual experience, to cope with vast problems on a world scale. They are not dealing with blueprints or day dreams. If and when the time comes for the carrying out of international rehabilitation schemes, there will be available a sizeable reservoir of experienced public servants not only in Washington but in all the other United

Nations. This augurs well for the success of international administration and organization when hostilities cease, provided the determination to work together continues.

It is generally believed that, if the benefits of military victory over the Axis nations are to be consolidated, a formal and well-integrated league or union may have to be adopted. If the present form of coordination continues and develops, however, it may be that a league or federation as such will not be necessary or will not have to be constructed immediately and in one piece, either during or after the conflict. Out of the links now connecting the United Nations may be forged firm bonds for permanent collaboration. International government created in this unspectacular fashion may lack the glamor that might be associated with a great charter or a solemn covenant, but it should be remembered that international arrangements developing in an *ad hoc* manner may prove stronger and have a far sounder basis for the future than a special new edifice constructed at one stroke of the pen.

During the transition period between the close of military operations and the negotiation of a peace settlement, the war-time agencies of collaboration could continue to function. The view that this period should, and probably will, last for several years has gained wide acceptance. In such an event, the Combined Raw Materials Board and the Combined Production and Resources Board, in collaboration with the lend-lease administration, and with additional members from the other United Nations, might through merger or in close liaison assume responsibility for planning and executing a program of economic reconstruction. . . . The Combined Shipping Adjustment Board . . . would doubtless continue to carry on in cooperation with the economic agencies.—Payson S. Wild, Jr., *Associate Professor of Government, Harvard University*. "Machinery of Collaboration Between the United Nations." *Foreign Policy Reports*. J1 1, '42. p. 106-7.

When the war is over and the soldiers and sailors return home, they, and all mankind will wish to be assured of a lasting peace that will command the support of all peoples of all races, nations and creeds. This must be a peace based on a more far-reaching and more specific program than the Atlantic Charter and more fundamental than Wilson's 14 points.

The peace we seek is one that will end all wars and release man's extraordinary technological skill for the conquest of poverty everywhere. We have no complete blueprint for this post-war world, nor does anyone else, but we do know the problems, social, economic and political, and we are searching for the answers.

The Post War World Council is convinced that world cooperation is necessary if predatory world anarchy is to be crushed. While we are of the belief that Anglo-American world domination would be less bad than any other, we are opposed to domination by any nation or group of nations. This would lead inevitably to another war, totalitarianism and the abnegation of democracy. It would incur the hatred of all peoples dominated. It would be the road to despair, not the road to freedom. It would mean the complete militarization of the United States to a degree never before equalled in the history of mankind. It would mean the perpetuation of colonial imperialism.

Our program is no more static than the world scene, but our points of emphasis are basic and we are aware that the conduct of the war conditions the peace. We stand for this program:

#### ON THE HOME FRONT

1. Preserve the Bill of Rights.
2. Let the costs of war be borne according to ability through taxation. Prevent inflation and eliminate war profits.
3. Maintain unaltered and extend social services and social legislation.
4. Establish democratic controls over economic processes.

5. Avoid a militarization of the mind and an extension of compulsory military training in the schools.

6. Extend democracy in all branches of the services with promotion based on merit, not favoritism.

7. Assure equality of opportunity for Negroes in all phases of life.

8. Continue opposition to all manifestations of anti-Semitism.

#### ON THE INTERNATIONAL FRONT

1. Educate for democratic world organization.

2. Send humanitarian aid, under proper safeguards, to all peoples who need it.

3. Work for the earliest possible attainment of a just and lasting peace, to be worked out by all parties to the war in full and free conference, not dictated by the victors to the vanquished.

4. Recognize the full equality of all races, white and colored alike.

5. Assure free access of all peoples to all raw materials and markets.

6. Grant freedom to India and to all other subject peoples.  
—*Statement by Post War World Council. New York. '42*

The International difficulties will be exactly the same whether we speak of a World Organization, a Federation, a Confederation, a Union Now, or a Revitalized League of Nations. Nomenclature is of absolutely minor importance.

One experience stands forth from these twenty years of collaboration, and that is the necessity for having a *universal* world organization if we want collective security and a stable and just peace. That does not mean that every nation on earth should immediately be a member of such an organization. And I was glad to see that those calm, peaceful, sober men who, signed the Introduction to the recent volume of *International*

*Conciliation* mention the possibility and the probability of its becoming necessary by the end of the war to occupy Germany and Japan.

To my mind it will be necessary to do something more than that. It will be necessary to make the totalitarian countries mandated territories until they give evidence that they are mature for modern democratic government; and we cannot now predict how long that will be.

The mandate system as worked out in the Covenant of the League of Nations and in the Versailles Treaty was a new thing and a good thing. The mandated territories were classed in three different groups according to their standards of civilization, and the idea was that they should be gradually developed until they could be given full self-government without any risk for the safety of the world.

The first mandated territory to be given full self-government was Iraq. Whether it was a premature act of kindness or whether done in the fullness of time, I leave to every individual to decide for himself. Syria and Palestine were next on the list, and then came a number of former colonies in the Pacific Ocean and elsewhere. The fate of some of those mandated territories is a good object lesson. They proved, if anybody needed proof, that those nations which had been clamoring for colonies, and had had the mental support of millions of sentimental people in many neutral or disinterested countries, did not for one moment want colonies because colonies solved any of their population problems, but wanted them because they supplied bases for attack upon the rest of the nations.

I entirely agree with the authors of this report from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace that there must be a long transition period between the last battle and the final agreement on future world order; and during that period it must be tried, if possible, to find in the totalitarian countries a nucleus of persons that can help to build up a new mentality in those countries. It may also be possible, under the mandate system,



that some form of central government can grow out of local self-government.

Conditions may vary from one country to another, but the main fact remains that for years the minds of the young people of the totalitarian countries have been twisted and perverted to conceptions so entirely different from our conceptions of honest government that we cannot trust them until a new system of education has brought about new results. It may also be that any mandate commissions exercising power in the totalitarian countries will need large-scale assistance from doctors having experience with asylums and sanatoria, and also from people having sound experience with reformatories.—C. J. Hambro, *Princeton, N.J.; Norwegian statesman and former newspaper publisher. Annals of the American Academy. Jl. '42. p. 110-11.*

It has been said that most of the countries of the world fear the peace even more than they do the war. To understand this fear one has only to make up any list he may choose of the important problems the post-war world will face. Here is a random selection:

1. Repair of the vast physical destruction of the war.
2. Reestablishment of international economic life in a shattered world.
3. Organization of international political life to safeguard the peace of the future.
4. Reconciliation of political nationalism with our cultural and economic internationalism.
5. Restoration of tolerance and faith in a world indoctrinated with hate and fear.
6. Efficient organization of government—for legislation and administration in a technical, large-unit world.
7. Readjustment from war economy to peace economy so as to avoid great depressions and their waves of unemployment.
8. Mitigation of insecurity—social and psychological.
9. Education of people everywhere toward greater economic, political, and social literacy.

. . . Those who look beyond the headlines perceive the solid progress which social students have made even in the confusion of the last two decades. During that period a flood of new data bearing upon social processes has become available from government and private sources. . . . The personnel with technical competence and understanding, while still grossly inadequate for the task, is growing. A steady improvement has been made in the tools of analysis and investigation.

As one compares the present situation with that which existed when this country entered the First World War, one realizes that we are today far better equipped for intelligent judgment and action than we ever were before, in such fields as production, trade, finance, national income, and a whole range of other economic and social data. Systematic research has given us insight and knowledge in relation to many of the intricacies involved in international questions. . . .

This inner growth in the social sciences has been paralleled by a growth of institutions for advanced work and teaching. Before 1920 there was no National Bureau of Economic Research, no Brookings Institution, no Social Science Research Council, no Institute of Pacific Relations, no Foreign Policy Association, no Council on Foreign Relations, no Royal Institute of International Affairs, no Institute for Advanced Study, no Institute of Human Relations, no Public Administration Clearing House, no Food Research Institute and no Industrial Research Department. Today these and other centers, in universities and outside, constitute public assets of immeasurable importance. They have provided increased accessibility to materials; they have aided group effort, group criticism and group morale; they have facilitated the making of comparative studies. On the forge of their broad activities in research and in teaching, the basis for better understanding of the relations between man and his fellow man is being shaped.—*Raymond B. Fosdick, President, Rockefeller Foundation. Education for Victory. Jl 15, '42. p. 22.*

*Advantages of the Universal over Regional Basis:*

1. It does not divide the world into armed camps which may sooner or later operate against each other on a simple basis of balance of power and thus provoke rather than prevent war.

2. It provides a common basis and consequently a more effective one for non-political activities in which practically all nations have a common interest: things such as the control of the slave trade and the regulation of the drug traffic.

3. If a universal system can be made to work, because of its very size it would give better protection to its members than could a more limited regional plan.

4. It gives a wider opportunity for economic cooperation which would be beneficial to all members.

5. It does not exclude any state which wishes to belong because of its geographic location.

6. It makes possible the setting up of a limited organization on bases other than geographic. For example, it would be possible to create a League or Federation of States with a common political outlook regardless of their actual location. The basis might be belief in democracy, people of a similar race, or peoples with a common interest in the maintenance of world order. The British Commonwealth of Nations, for instance, could not exist on the basis of the theory of regionalism.

7. All schemes eventually hope to become universal and the advocates of this approach to the problem maintain that it is more satisfactory to start with a loose organization covering a large number of states and then gradually tighten the organization, than it is to start with a tight organization in a limited area and then try to expand the area.

*The Advantages of Regional over Universal Basis:*

1. It provides a tighter and hence a more efficient organization. It would be practically impossible for any state to secede from such a union and consequently there would be less chance of back-sliding. It would also have a stronger executive power

which would enable it to do many things that the looser universal organization could not attempt.

2. It is more easily organized because of the proximity of the members, and because there is greater likelihood of there being a common interest between states that are reasonably close together. While this is not very obvious in Western Europe it is much more so in the Americas.

3. It would provide a possible starting point for a wider union. When the advantages of the limited regional pact became apparent, other pacts might be formed elsewhere and eventually all might be drawn together to form a universal organization.

4. There is less chance of friction between the component parts because there is a greater likelihood of getting a common interest to all.

5. The world has had more experience with this type of organization and there is not the same distrust of something that is absolutely new. In other words, it seems to be a more practical type of organization.

6. The advocates of this method all argue in contradiction to those who believe in the universal scheme, that it is easier to proceed from a tight organization in a limited area to a wider area, than it is to proceed as in number 7 [of Advantages of Universal over Regional Basis].

There are many advantages and disadvantages in each method of approach. Which is better depends on the type of international organization that is set up. It also depends on the degree of urgency, that is, the extent of the dangers from not acting to create some international organization. We in Canada have had some experience with each approach. Our own federation is an example of the regional, our membership in the Commonwealth of Nations is an illustration of a limited political union on a non-geographic basis, and our membership in the League of Nations gave us some experience with the universal type of organization.—R. O. MacFarlane, *University of Manitoba*. "Beginning at the End; Canada and the Post-War World." F. 15, '42. p. 4-6.

There is nothing new in the idea of an International Police Force; in fact it is as old as the hills. It can be traced as far back as the days of ancient Greece when the federations and confederations of the City States arranged to pool their military and naval resources in a common force to maintain peace amongst themselves and as a mutual protection against aggression from their enemies outside. Subsequently, the Roman Garrisons acted as a policing force and maintained the rule of law in the vast territories of the Roman Empire for a period of more than five hundred years. During the centuries that followed the fall of Rome, plans for constituting an International Police Force were suggested from time to time, notably by two Frenchmen, Sully and St. Pierre, and by William Penn, Immanuel Kant, and many others.

In recent years the idea was championed by Theodore Roosevelt, and in 1910 the United States Congress unanimously passed a resolution in favor of an international navy. Both Houses requested President Taft to sound the European governments as to whether they would be prepared to join the U. S. A. in establishing such a force. In reply, Sir Edward Grey said in the House of Commons that this proposal would receive the sympathetic consideration of the British Government. The Kaiser, however, bluntly turned it down. Had the navies of the U. S. A., Great Britain, Germany, and France been constituted into an International Police Force to secure the freedom of the seas under the control of an International Authority, it is conceivable that World Wars I and II might have been prevented. However this may be, it is interesting to note that the foremost protagonists of an International Police Force at the beginning of the century were the leaders of the Republican party in the U. S. A. They realized that it was only through a combination of moral and physical force that the rule of law could be established. Subsequently, at the conclusion of World War I, Article 16 of the Covenant was intended by its framers to become the foundation upon which the members of the

League of Nations could build up an organization of economic and military sanctions sufficiently powerful to deter any nation from resorting to war. In his address to the Peace Conference in Paris, President Wilson said, "If the moral force of the world will not suffice, the physical force of the world shall."—*Lord David Davies, England. Free World. Ap. '42. p. 213-14.*

No one whose duty it is to look and try to visualize how we are going to demobilize as well as mobilize can but be concerned as to the tremendous problems that will arise at that time and all the dynamite that exists in consequence. It is essential, therefore, that countries should agree upon the objectives to be aimed for, and if I may state it in a word, I would say that it is the duty of statesmen, industrialists, labor leaders and everybody to be ready to discipline themselves to curb every selfish interest in the decade following the close of hostilities in order that the world can be set on a course of peace and progressive development and be prevented from again relapsing into the attempted barbarism of this age.

Let me develop that.

In war, out of the sheer desire for self-preservation, we are ready to undergo control, regulation, and discipline, of the most amazing character, beyond the belief of what most of us would have thought possible. Now we do that, I repeat, for self-preservation. As soon as the "cease fire" sounds, there may be a danger of a tremendous reaction. It is, I suggest, then that the statesmen of the world and all those responsible for the leadership of mankind must stand together resolutely and hold on to some form of controls while the foundations of peace, stability, and orderly development, are being worked out.

In the first case we submit to control for self-preservation, and in the second case we must submit to national and international discipline for the sake of the generations yet unborn.

I trust, therefore, that the International Labour Office will be able to approach this problem in such a way that it will get the governments and the great industrial leaders of all states

to recognize this essential fact and so be able to suppress any sudden desire for immediate gain on either side and devote themselves to the real task of laying a solid foundation—and what a task, when you realise the terrible devastation in Russia, Eastern Europe, and in China, where the land fighting has been on so great a scale, and when you consider how much further that devastation may extend.

It has been said that the seeds of every great war were sown in the settlement of a previous war. If that has been true in the past, cannot we now, by care, equally sow the seeds of lasting peace during and at the end of this war?

No country can afford at the end of this struggle to be blinded by its own limited interest, nor can it make its contribution to the future progress of the peoples of the world unless it is prepared to look at the problems of the world as a whole.

I have always been struck by the contribution that can be made irrespective of nationality when the people of the different countries can be induced to look at a problem on its merits. Perhaps the greatest proof of this is in the work of the International Labour Organisation itself. There it has been demonstrated that, irrespective of limited national interest, agreement has been possible on common social policies, thereby raising standards together, to the common advantage.

Therefore, the less you discuss things as countries and the more you can face them as problems affecting all countries, the more likely are you to find a correct solution.

In this question of grappling with problems you do at the same time solve a good many questions of human relationships. Because immediately you get away from the purely nationalistic outlook or from the limited vision that arises from your own interest, and proceed to grapple with problems as such, then inevitably the mental barriers that nationalism or narrow interest creates are broken down. The endeavour to find a solution brings people together in a manner that nothing else does, as is shown in the world of science and the arts. If you can

remove the sheer fear arising from national barriers and create confidence in the world of industry and primary production, and if the objective that you want to reach is clear, namely, the raising of the standard of life of the people as a whole, then everyone gains in the ultimate solution and human relationship is enhanced in the process of finding it.—*Ernest Bevin, British Minister of Labor and National Service, in speech at London meeting of the Emergency Committee of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, April 20, 1942. International Labour Review. Jl. '42. p.3-4.*

To meet these various needs and conditions a United Nations Political Council should be created in which all of the countries should be represented which have subscribed to the ideas and purposes of the contract. The experience of the Pacific Council, incomplete as it is, proves that such a body may be established. That Council, though far different from a Supreme Council for that area, is presided over by the President of the United States. A machinery much more elaborate can be devised which would cover a much larger field both geographically and from the point of view of the problems to be dealt with.

One principal difficulty is immediately presented; how to recognize the differences in responsibilities and the hierarchy of tasks which exist among the United Nations? How can the various regional needs be reconciled with those of a worldwide nature, which fall largely, at least for the time being, upon some few of the United Nations?

One answer is to be found in the adoption of the principle that the sessions of the Council should be attended only by the members directly interested in the questions to be discussed at a specific time. That would allow this body to function at the same time as a general council, when needed, and as a regional or restricted Council also. Regionalism in time of war does not fulfill every need. In many cases, in questions of



production of certain raw materials, for instance, an African country, a European government, or an Asiatic power may be equally interested while other nations are not.

But the greatest advantage of this principle of attendance at the sessions by the representatives of the interested nations only, would be this: Some nations would, through reasons of their importance as regards their situation, fighting forces, production and contributions of all kinds to the war effort, be, in fact, represented at all meetings.

That would solve a controversy which existed from the very first days of the League of Nations about the permanent and non-permanent members of its Council. - The Clause of the Covenant, according to which the big Powers were to be permanent members with the addition of a certain number of elected ones, led to all sorts of disagreements and difficulties with nations like China, Brazil, Spain, and Poland. It was often argued also that the great Powers, even if they had not received the privilege in the form of permanent seats, evidently would have been recognized by the free will of the others as having the right to sit permanently in their common council. Such controversies in time of war would be unthinkable and extremely dangerous to a successful conclusion of hostilities. Some way must be devised to avoid them.

The proposal formulated above would, in fact, meet the legitimate claims of Russia and also of China. It would allow them to participate in all discussions in which they are interested. That would cover a very large field. Paradoxically enough, even a situation such as that of Russia's being at peace with Japan could thus be met, since any member would be free to be absent from these sessions in which his country would not be interested.

At the same time, any one of the United Nations would be certain to take part in any discussions of the many questions in which their present or their future would be concerned. For practical purposes, the Council would often function as a regional organization, Asiatic, European, Australasian. Political com-

mittees would, in fact, develop within this frame. The services the Allied Nations render to the common cause would constitute the basis of their participation both in the political council and in the subordinate technical committees which would be created under it.

In all these bodies, this rule of participation in the work common to all the interested members of the community, according to services, should be fully applied.—*Henri Bonnet*, "United Nations, What They Are, What They May Become." *World Citizens Association*. 1942. p. 60-2.



## ORGANIZATIONS WORKING FOR POST-WAR PLANS

Annals of the American Academy. 3457 Walnut St. Phila. Pa.

Provides a forum for political, social and industrial problems here and abroad. Papers and studies by members are published in the *Annals* and occasionally in pamphlet form.

American Association of University Women. 1634 Eye St. N.W.  
Wash. D.C.

Includes work for a better international understanding and issues study materials for its members and groups. The Association is a constituent member of the International Federation of University Women, and one of the sponsors of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace.

American Bar Association. Committee on International Legal Problems  
Raised by War Conditions. Temple University School of Law.  
35 S. 9th St. Phila. Pa.

The Committee aims "to bring about the supremacy of international law with its concomitants of judicial settlement, treaty observance, and conciliation through diplomacy." It proposes to conduct research on various phases of internationalism such as arbitral tribunals, executive agencies for the administration of international law, a world court, an international organization or alliance for the nations of this hemisphere, and to carry on an educational campaign to stress the importance of international law.

American Council on Public Affairs. 2153 Florida Av. Wash. D.C.

The Council aims "to promote the spread of authoritative facts and significant opinions concerning contemporary social and economic problems." Its publications include international and post-war studies.

American Free World Association. 55 W. 42d St. N.Y.

The American section of the Free World Association. Publishes *Free World*; a monthly magazine of democracy and world affairs. Its program includes complete victory, establishment of freedom based on economic, social, religious and cultural rights, a democratic world organization and collective security.

American Friends Service Committee. 20 S. 12th St. Phila. Pa.

Carries on peace education through summer Institutes of International Relations, and has a small research unit to study an acceptable international structure from the viewpoint of religious pacifism.

American Jewish Committee. Research Institute on Peace and Post-War Problems. 386 4th Av. N.Y.

Exists to protect the welfare and rights of the Jews throughout the world and its studies of post-war problems reflect this viewpoint. Includes political, legal, social and economic problems, migration and colonization, relief and reconstruction.

American Peace Society. 734 Jackson Pl. Wash. D.C.

This Society for 150 years has maintained the general aim of a better international order. As a clearing house it performs a special service for all constructive proposals of post-war reconstruction, and plans intensive study through discussions of a Round Table recently formed. Its official organ, *World Affairs*, is its chief publication, its pamphlet publications usually being reprints from it.

American Union for Concerted Peace Efforts. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y.

Is preparing a report.

American Youth Odyssey. Correspondence-Conference Center. World Fellowship, Inc. Conway, N.H.

Inter-American and given to problems of post-war reconstruction. Emphasizes viewpoint of youth.

Belgian Commission for the study of Postwar Problems. New York Division. 630 5th Av. N.Y.

A division of the Belgian government's London Commission. Is studying post-war problems for that area.

Biosophical Institute. 1977 Broadway. N.Y.

Includes among its purposes work for the ideals of democracy, character and peace education, the overcoming of national and racial prejudices, and work for world citizenship and peace. A Peace Research Center of the Institute is concerned with special problems of a post-war lasting peace. Its publications include the *Biosophical Review* and some pamphlets.

British Library of Information. 30 Rockefeller Plaza. N.Y.

Problems as seen from the British point of view.

Brookings Institution. 722 Jackson Pl. Wash. D.C.

Has published international studies and is engaged on studies of post-war reconstruction, with special reference to economic phases.

Campaign for World Government. 166 W. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, Ill.

Its major purpose is the advocacy of "the calling of a world constitutional convention to draft the constitution for a democratic, non-military and all-inclusive world federation." It also favors a Congressional Commission, which would study and weigh all peace plans, and submit a formulation of peace aims to the legislatures of other countries. Its publications include a quarterly bulletin, *World Federation—Now*, and pamphlets.

Canadian Institute of International Affairs. 3 Willcocks St. Toronto, Can.

Post-war problems as seen especially in relation to Canada and the British Empire. A pamphlet series *Behind the Headlines*, mimeographed bibliographies, and other publications are issued.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 405 W. 117th St. N.Y.

This Endowment issues various valuable publications, including *International Conciliation*, a monthly pamphlet which includes texts of treaties, diplomatic correspondence, and plans for international projects.

Catholic Association for International Peace. 1312 Massachusetts Av. Wash. D.C.

"The chief purpose is the preparation and distribution of studies applying Christian teaching to international life. This work applies to all post-war problems." Various aspects of internationalism are comprised in its pamphlet series distributed at a nominal cost.

Central and Eastern European Planning Board. 151 E. 67th St. N.Y.

Czechoslovak-Greek, Yugoslav and Polish groups carrying on research in the problems of reconstruction for Central and Eastern Europe.

Church Peace Union. 70 5th Av. N.Y.

Works with and through churches and in cooperation with other groups studying peace plans. Has especially close association with the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.

Citizens for Victory. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y.

A group organized after the entrance of the United States into the war through the Council for Democracy and members of the Committee to Defend America and Fight for Freedom. Its chief purpose is to see that the war is won, a just peace is established, and democratic principles are preserved; to these ends it has taken an active interest in opposing the reelection of isolationists to Congress. It uses various publicity channels and expects to issue publications.

Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace. *See* Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace.

Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y.

"Organized in 1939 to study the problems of post-war reconstruction and the organization of peace." Comprises over 150 experts in various fields.

"The Commission has issued two reports: *Preliminary Report and Monographs*—the Report is a statement of principles which the Commission considers fundamental to the organization of peace, and the supporting monographs deal with the basic problems of peace organization; the *Second Report* discusses the problems which will have to be faced immediately at the close of war—such problems as famine, disease, uprooted peoples, and the political control necessary to maintain order." Its *Bulletin* carries summaries or full official or non-official suggestions for the organization of peace, also bibliographies and reports of the work of other organizations.

Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims. 101 Park Av. N.Y.

For over a quarter of a century the Committee has taken active interest in African problems. Its aim, in relation to post-war problems, is to prepare public opinion for the "constructive treatment of Africa's problems at the peace conference, and to form a basis for college, high school and group study on international and interracial affairs." Its recent report, *The Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American Standpoint* is an exposition of its views and recommendations.

Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church. 740 Rush St. Chicago, Ill.

Council for Democracy. 11 W. 42d St. N.Y.

An educational organization and clearing house for "the realization and promotion of practical democracy." Its post-war aims are: to collect and disseminate information that people may be prepared for the peace; to guard personal liberties; and to work for international cooperation and freedom, political, social, and cultural.

Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches. 289 4th Av. N.Y.

Is working in general, through research, education and action, for Christian ideals in national and international relations.

Council on Foreign Relations. 45 E. 65th St. N.Y.

An academic organization which includes groups studying post-war problems along economic, financial, political, territorial lines, and peace aims. Such of its studies as are published are contained in a quarterly review, *Foreign Affairs*, and in books listed in the usual bibliographical sources.

Czechoslovak Economic Council, Inc. 1790 Broadway. N.Y.

Is preparing the groundwork for the economic reconstruction and policies of Czechoslovakia.

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace. 297 4th Av. N.Y.

Its general purposes are "to clarify the mind of the churches regarding the moral, political, and economic foundations of an enduring peace," to stress appropriate responsibility for its establishment, and to consider gatherings of Christian leaders to help bring it about. A National Study Conference convened by it at Ohio Wesleyan University March 2-5, 1942 presented a statement of guiding principles and recommendations. Has issued a few pertinent pamphlets.

Federal Union, Inc. 10 E. 40th St. N.Y.

Organized in 1939 "for American leadership in forming a Federal Union of free peoples as the nucleus of a world government." Its program was based on Clarence K. Streit's *Union Now* and his *Union Now With Britain*. It also issues pamphlets, and a monthly publication, *Federal Union World*, to promote its special aims.

Fellowship of Reconciliation. 2929 Broadway. N.Y.

Works from the standpoint of religious pacifism in protest against war, in the upholding of a better way than violence for the solution of conflict, and the fostering of goodwill among nations.

Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. Medford, Mass.

A graduate school of international affairs stressing an informed and intelligent leadership in that field. "Since the outbreak of the Second World War an appreciable part of the educational task of the school is that of examining the available evidence and analyzing the forces and factors which have given rise to the contemporary state of affairs in order to discover what ground there may be for an improved world order in any future period of reconstruction."

Foreign Affairs Forum. 297 4th Av. N.Y.

Carries on educational work. Two recent publications of international interest.

Foreign Policy Association, Inc. 22 E. 38th St. N.Y.

A long-established organization which carries on research through experts in the international field, post-war studies being now included. Among its numerous and valuable publications are its *Foreign Policy Reports*, a series of semi-monthly documented studies, and a 4-page weekly, *Foreign Policy Bulletin*.

Free Europe. 11 Grower St. London W.C.1.

Free World Association. International Headquarters. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y.

A clearing house for democratic forces, having as objectives opposition to the Axis and encouragement and assistance to the subject peoples. It includes "preparation for a world organization and a system of general security, as envisaged in the Eight-Point Program of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill."

Freedom House. 32 E. 51st St. N.Y.

Formed in October, 1941 as a channel for "the exaltation and exploration of the meaning of freedom." It works through radio broadcasting, classes, literature and other means of education to acquaint people with the true meaning of the war, the need of discarding isolationism, and the reconstruction of civilization in terms of "freedom, peace and security."

Friends' Peace Committee. 304 Arch St. Phila. Pa.

Part of its work is in the international field. Largely stresses principles of pacifism and peace.

Geneva Research Centre. 24 Av. de France. Geneva, Switz.

A *Second Report* on study projects undertaken by research agencies on post-war problems was published late 1941.

General Federation of Women's Clubs. 1734 N. St. N.W. Wash. D.C.

Studies and maintains an interest in international problems as part of a broad study program. Is affiliated with the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War.

Harvard Council on Postwar Problems. 31 Holyhoke St. Cambridge, Mass.

A student discussion group in post-war planning aiming "to popularize the terms of a liberal peace." Work through meetings, radio programs, etc. and issue occasional releases.

Institute for Advanced Study. Princeton, N.J.

Has issued *World Organization 1920-1940*, by American experts, dealing with the League of Nations, the International Court, and the International Labor Office.

Institute of Democratic Reconstruction, Antioch College. Yellow Springs, O.

A semi-autonomous unit studying world order plans, investigating democratic peace and training leadership.

Institute of Jewish Affairs. 115 Broadway. N.Y.

Analyses fundamental aspects of Jewish life as a basis of facts on which to secure Jewish post-war rights.

Institute of Pacific Relations. American Council. 129 E. 52d St. N.Y.

Cooperates with other national councils of the Institute in the special field of international relations of the Pacific area. Has issued many publications and studies, and issues the *Far Eastern Survey*, a fortnightly research service, and *Pacific Affairs*, a quarterly journal of the International Secretariat.

Institute of World Economics. 3000 39th St. N.W. Wash. D.C.

Formed in December 1941 with the aim of coordinating "the research of various regional and topical institutes." Its first two conferences were held in New York on January 24th and June 27th, 1942, and discussed problems of interest to post-war settlements.

Institute on World Organization. 1907 F. St. N.W. Wash. D.C.

Formed by a group of experts who have had practical experience in international affairs, to serve as a center of study, research, coordination and education with the view of influencing a just and durable peace. Its far aim is a practical world organization, and it eventually looks to the adoption of a definite plan for such.

Inter-Allied Information Committee. 610 5th Av. N.Y.

Has prepared survey material on agencies, government, non-official, international, and non-American, working on post-war and reconstruction problems, and bibliographies.

International Labor Organization. Washington Office. 734 Jackson Pl. Wash. D.C. (Temporary International Working Center. McGill University. 3480 University St. Montreal. Can.)

An association of nations formed at Geneva, Switzerland in connection with the League of Nations, to take care of all problems touching the welfare of labor throughout the world. It is controlled by representatives of governments and employers' and workers' organizations. Due to the war its work is centered, for the time being, in Canada. Held a special International Labor Conference in New York Oct. 27-Nov. 5, 1941, closing Nov. 6th at the White House. Publishes information relative to a post-war order, with special reference to its social and economic objectives; its publications also include a monthly periodical, the *International Labour Review*.



International Student Service. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y.

Works with students, and in relation to both domestic and international problems. Its monthly magazine *Threshold* is largely concerned with post-war problems; has published also several pamphlets and mimeographed reports of conferences.

Labour Party. Transport House. Smith Sq. London S.W.1.

League for Industrial Democracy. Committee on Postwar Reconstruction. 112 E. 19th St. N.Y.

Studies are now being carried on for post-war reconstruction in the United States and proposals for international organization.

League for World Federation. 214 A. St. N.E. Wash. D.C.

A plan for using the League of Nations as capitol of the Federation of the World.

League of Nations Association. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y.

Has publications available touching its special line of interest. Cooperates with the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace.

League of Nations. Economic, Financial and Transit Department. Institute for Advanced Study. Princeton, N.J.

Post-war phases of its work deal with facts and problems of economics. Its studies are technical rather than popular in interest.

National Bureau of Economic Research. 1819 Broadway. N.Y.

Carries on research in the economic, social and industrial fields, and cooperates with other groups and individuals. Its pamphlet, *Economic Research in War and Reconstruction* covers the plans of the Bureau for the war and post-war periods.

National Conference of Christians and Jews. 381 4th Av. N.Y.

Carries on a wide educational and publicity work for the purpose of allaying religious prejudice, establishing cooperation and developing understanding. Its post-war attitude is based on the spiritual motive as the keynote for social, economic and political changes. Institutes are held at the Williamstown Institute of Human Relations and elsewhere for the interchange of opinion.

National Council for Prevention of War. 1013 18th St. N.W. Wash. D.C.

"We attempt to influence legislation. . . . Second, we believe in what the Pope on May 13 called 'an honest peace of justice and moderation' and will encourage our government and our allies to seek the earliest possible opportunity for reaching such a peace. However, we are studying also the elements of a just and lasting peace."

National Council on Post-War Problems. 1013 18th St. N.W. Wash. D.C.

Issues a small monthly publication *Peace Action*, and bibliographies.

National Council of Women of the United States. 501 Madison Av. N.Y.

Affiliated with the International Council of Women. Have drawn up some general proposals for consideration in the peace discussion, including the guarantee of liberty, freedom of worship, security and well-being, civil and political rights, and an international economic commission; but plan to work toward more specific recommendations.

National Peace Conference. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y.

"A consultative clearing house" for the views of various member organizations interested in a new world order. Holds that the cooperation of agencies should be extended into the post-war period to meet such needs as relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction. Its *National Peace Conference Bulletin* furnishes a monthly report of the activities and policies of the Conference and its member organizations.

National Planning Association. 800 21st St. N.W. Wash. D.C.

Composed of members of government, science, the professions, business and government. Includes international reconstruction and world order as well as domestic. Issues a monthly *Public Policy Digest*, and a series of *Planning Pamphlets*.

National Resources Planning Board. Wash. D.C.

Its pamphlets on post-war planning relate to our national problem, but are of general interest on the larger reconstruction program, particularly in relation to social and economic aspects.

Near East Foundation. 17 W. 46th St. N.Y.

Concerned with problems of the Near East.

Netherland Study Group for Postwar Reconstruction. Suite 716, 10 Rockefeller Plaza. N.Y.

Carries on research with the view of developing plans for the reconstruction of the Netherlands.

New School for Social Research. Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science. 66 W. 12th St. N.Y.

Has a large number of experts on its research staff and is giving increased attention to studies bearing on post-war problems. Various pamphlets have been published under its Peace Research Project. Also publishes *Social Research*, an international quarterly of political and social science.

New York University. Graduate School Seminar on Post-War Reconstruction Problems. Washington Sq. East. N.Y.

A research forum aiming at contributions along constructive lines to post-war problems. *Problems of Post-War Reconstruction*, edited by H. P. Jordan, and published by the American Council on Public Affairs, contains monographs by various members of the Seminar staff.

Pacifist Research Bureau. 1201 Chestnut St. Phila. Pa.

Consists of representative religious pacifists who are carrying on research. Among the subjects of post-war interest being studied are peace aims and proposals, relief and reconstruction, means of implementing world order or organization, pacific action, religious principles, and socio-economic basic rules. No publications to date.

Political and Economic Planning (PEP) 16 Queen Anne's Gate. London S.W.1.

Has published a list of organizations in England working on reconstruction—*British Reconstruction Agencies* (Planning. No. 186).

Post War World Council. 112 E. 19th St. N.Y.

Formerly the Keep America Out of War Congress. The Council upholds a democratic and lasting peace worked out in free conference, economic justice which would include access of all to raw materials and markets, the ending of imperialisms and dictatorships with equality for all races and freedom for India, and world cooperation and organization. It views the Atlantic Charter as an unsatisfactory basis on which to establish peace. Its activities are reported in a monthly *News Release*.

Rand School of Social Science. 7 E. 16th St. N.Y.

This labor school has two groups especially studying international problems, an International Council composed of scholars, a summary of some of whose deliberations are included in its pamphlet *War Aims, Peace Terms and the World After the War*; and a later Commission on Post-war Economic Problems. Some pamphlet publications are available.

Research Center for European Federation. Philosophy Bldg. New York University. University Heights. N.Y.

Formed in February 1942 under the chairmanship of Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, author of *Europe Must Unite*, and advocate of a federated Europe. Its program includes the establishment of three organizations: A universal, unpolitical League of Nations; an Atlantic Union, and a United States of Europe. It aims to coordinate similar efforts elsewhere, to collaborate with other institutions, to study other suggestions and to promote practical plans for European post-war reconstruction.

Russian Economic Institute. 429 W. 117th St. N.Y.

One of the cooperating members of the Institute of World Economics, and engaged in increasing "the knowledge and understanding of contemporary Russia." In relation to the post-war world it is stated that there is "no doubt that any plan of world recovery and reorganization will be illusory unless an adequate role is assigned to the Eurasian region." No publications mentioned.

Twentieth Century Fund. 330 W. 42d St. N.Y.

Largely economic and educational in interest. In the international field it has included a survey of institutional research on post-war problems by Galloway, and works on reconstruction problems by Stuart Chase.

United States Committee on Educational Reconstruction. 2 W. 45th St. N.Y.

Aims to serve educational reconstruction by stimulating deliberation, encouraging concrete planning and acting as a clearing house of such plans.

War Resisters League. Room 314, 2 Stone St. N.Y.

A pacifist organization holding that notwithstanding our abhorrence of the Japanese attack we must share in its causes; and advocating opposition to all war, non-partisan relief work, economic justice, an early and just peace, and world government. Issues leaflets.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. 1734 F. St. N.W. Wash. D.C. National Literature Committee. 1924 Chestnut St. Phila. Pa.

Upholds a broad program, including an early peace, a transition period, racial equality, a governmental commission to study plans for world government and reconstruction, and in general the establishment of conditions based on principles of unity, democracy and justice.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y.

Maintains the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Library, a reference center on materials relating to the League of Nations and associated agencies. Has a special section for post-war plans, data, documents, etc. for the use of scholars, students and research workers.

World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches. 70 5th Av. N.Y.

Particularly interested in international friendship and cooperation in relation to the activities of religious groups. Publishes some pamphlets and leaflets, and the *World Alliance News Letter*.

World Citizen Movement. 30 E. Lorain St. Oberlin, O.

Aims to promote world consciousness and to establish a new world order through world citizenship.

World Citizens Association. 84 E. Randolph St. Chicago, Ill.

Strives to develop world-mindedness and study of world problems for the eventual harmonizing of races, nations and cultural associations. A Platform of World Citizenship, adopted December 9, 1939, is given in Appendix 3 of Henri Bonnet's *The United Nations: What They Are, What They May Become*.

World Federalists. 53 E. 34th St. N.Y.

Seeks a democratic federal world government and by means of petitions endeavors to influence the President and Congress to call an official World Constitutional Convention which might draft a World Constitution and thus form the basis for the proposed government. It has drafted a tentative plan toward the organization of conventions through which to work, and circulates a 5-page leaflet *We Need World Government*.

World Government Association. 110 E. 42d St. N.Y.

Maintains research on post-war reconstruction.

World Peace Foundation. 40 Mt. Vernon St. Bost. Mass.

Seeks to create public understanding of international problems by presentation of facts.

World Peaceways. 103 Park Av. N.Y.

Stresses social welfare after the war.

Yale Institute of International Studies. Yale University. New Haven, Conn.

Carries on research in contemporary problems of international affairs.

## LISTS OF ORGANIZATIONS

Commercial and Financial Chronicle. 155:1446. Ap. 9, '42.

More than 100 government private agencies studying post-war social and economic problems.

Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. Bulletin. 2:1-20.

Mr.-Ap. '42.

Organizations working in the field of post-war reconstruction.

Galloway, George B. Postwar planning in the United States. 158p.

Twentieth Century Fund. 330 W. 42d St. N.Y. '42.

Describes the work of over 100 agencies, governmental and private, engaged in American post-war problems. Selected bibliography, p. 129-58. A digest of this survey is given in *Personnel Journal*. 20:363-6. Ap. '42, and in *World Affairs*. 105:32-3. Mr. '42.

Inter-Allied Information Center. Section for Information on Studies in Postwar Reconstruction. Research and postwar planning in the U.S.A.; list of agencies. [90]p. mime. The Center. 610 5th Av. N.Y. My. '42.

- Inter-Allied Information Center. Section for Information in Postwar Reconstruction. Research and postwar planning in the U.S.A.; list of agencies. No. 2. [36]p. mim. The Center. 610 5th Av. N.Y. My. '42.
- Inter-Allied Information Center. Section for Information on Studies in Postwar Reconstruction. Research and postwar planning in the U.S.A.; list of agencies. No. 3. [42]p. mim. The Center. 610 5th Ave. N.Y. Je. '42.
- Inter-Allied Information Center. Section for Information on Studies in Postwar Reconstruction. Research and postwar planning; survey of agencies. Part 4. [48]p. mim. The Center. 610 5th Av. N.Y. Jl.-Ag. '42.
- International Student Service. Post-War planning; a survey of recent organizational activities. 20p. The Service. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. Ap. '42.
- Journal of Social Psychology. 15:192-5. F. '42. Changing policies of peace and patriotic societies. Ralph H. Gundlach.
- National Education Association. Research Division. Supplement to Organizations interested in international relations, Research Bulletin, Vol. 17, no.4, September, 1939. 8p. The Association. 1201 16th St. N.W. Wash. D.C. F. '40.
- National Education Association Research Bulletin. 17:163-217. S. '39. Organizations interested in international relations.
- Public Opinion Quarterly. 6, no. 1:115-22. [Mr.] '42. Pressure groups and American foreign policy. John W. Masland.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

An asterisk (\*) preceding a reference indicates that the article or part of it has been reprinted in this book.

### GENERAL REFERENCES

#### BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Booklist. 38:317-21. My. 1, '42. Postwar planning—a reading list. Constance H. Brown, comp.
- Brodie, Fawn M. North Atlantic relations; annotated bibliography. 24p. mim. American Committee for International Studies. Princeton, N.J. '41.
- Canadian Institute of International Affairs. Post-war reconstruction studies; bibliography. 9p. mim. The Institute. 3 Willcocks St. Toronto. D. 22, '41.  
Supplement no. 1. 8p. mim. F. 27, '42; Supplement no. 2. 9p. mim. My. 22, '42.
- Claremont Library. War aims and peace aims; list of recent purchases by Claremont Colleges Library. 7p. mim. rev. ed. (Claremont Library lists no. 1) Claremont, Calif. Ap. '42.
- Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. Bulletin. 2:1-28. My.-Je. '42. General bibliography on international organization and post-war reconstruction. Hans Aufricht.
- Inter-Allied Information Center. Section for Information on Studies in Postwar Reconstruction. Research and postwar planning in the U.S.A.; bibliography. 101p. mim. The Center. 610 5th Av. N.Y. Ap. '42; No.2. p. 102-125. mim. My. '42.
- Inter-Allied Information Center. Section for Information on Studies in Postwar Reconstruction. Research and postwar planning in the U.S.A.; bibliography. No. 3. p. 126-70. mim. The Center. 610 5th Av. N.Y. Je. '42.
- Inter-Allied Information Center. Section for Information on Studies in Postwar Reconstruction. Research and postwar planning; bibliography. Part 4. p. 171-242. The Center. 610 5th Av. N.Y. Jl.-Ag. '42.
- Johnsen, Julia E. comp. Eight-points of post-war world reorganization. p. 103-26. (Reference Shelf. Vol. 15, no.5) H. W. Wilson Co. N.Y. Mr. '42.

- Johnsen, Julia E. comp. International federation of democracies (proposed). p. 239-63. (Reference Shelf. Vol. 14, no.8) H. W. Wilson Co. N.Y. Ap. '41.
- McCance, Letha F. comp. Post-war planning—a bibliography. 41p. mim. Library. National Resources Planning Board. Wash. D.C. Ja. '42.
- Phelps, Edith M. ed. University debaters' annual, 1941-1942. Vol. 28. H.W. Wilson Co. N.Y. '42.
- Bibliographies: A League of Nations, p. 92-100; A federation of democracies based on the Churchill-Roosevelt principles, p. 223-30; Post-war reconstruction, p. 250-7; Western Hemisphere solidarity, p. 397-404.
- United States. Library of Congress. Western hemisphere defense; a list of references. Helen F. Conover, comp. 39p. mim. rev. ed. Wash. D.C. Ja. 28, '42.
- University of South Dakota. War and the peace. 5p. mim. (You and the War bibliography no.1) The University. Vermillion, S.D. Ja. 23, '42.

## BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Adow, Benjamin. Permanent world peace; a practical scheme. 21p. Pamphlet Distributing Co. 313 W. 35th St. N.Y. '41.
- After-war educational reconstruction; a proposal to men of goodwill. 16p. (Personal Growth Leaflet no.151) National Education Association. 1201 16th St. N.W. Wash. D.C.
- American Association of School Administrators. Official Report, 1942: 218-28. Post-war world. Chester Rowell.
- American Association of School Administrators. Official Report, 1942: 228-37. Post-war education. William F. Russell.
- Same*. Teachers College Record. 43:521-31. Ap. '42; Texas Outlook. 26:13-16. Ap. '42.
- Boeckel, Florence Brewer. Leaflets on the post-war world. mim. National Council for Prevention of War. 1013 18th St. N.W. Wash. D.C. '42.
- Titles are: 1. Beyond war. 20p. F. '42; 2. Sovereignty and the four freedoms. 12p. Mr. '42; 3. Tariffs and the Atlantic Charter. 20p. Ap. '42; 4. Race prejudice and world war. 20p. My. '42; 5. Equal access to raw materials and related problems. 20p. Je. '42; 6. Concluding summary of change in ideas which must precede world change. Each leaflet includes a reading list.
- Brown, Philip Marshall. Science of peace. 63p. Fleming H. Revell Co. N.Y. '42.
- Brunauer, Esther Caukin. Reconstruction: steps from war to peace, the Second report of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. 8p. mim. American Association of University Women. 1634 I St. Wash. D.C. My. '42.

- Butler, Harold. *Lost peace; a personal impression*. 246p. Harcourt, Brace & Co. N.Y. '42.  
*Excerpts*. *International Labour Review*. 45:408-13. Ap. '42.
- Canadian Institute of International Affairs. *Blueprints for a new world*. 23p. (Behind the Headlines. Vol. 2, no.4) The Institute. 3 Willcocks St. Toronto, Can. F. 1, '42.  
 Reading list. p. 23.
- Carr, Edward Hallett. *Conditions of peace*. 282p. Macmillan Co. N.Y. '42.
- \*Catholic Association for International Peace. *Comparison of three programs for peace and post-war reconstruction*. 2p. mim. The Association. 1312 Massachusetts Av. N.W. Wash. D.C. '42.
- Clapper, Raymond and others. *What are our peace aims?* 16p. (American Forum of the Air. Vol. 4, no.23) Ransdell, Inc. Wash. D.C. Je. 7, '42.
- Clinchy, Everett Ross. *World we want to live in*. 98p. Doubleday, Doran & Co. Garden City, N.Y. '42.
- Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. *Second report; the transitional period*. 23p. The Commission. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. F. '42.
- Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. *Study course on immediate postwar problems; based upon the Second report: The transitional period*. 39p. The Commission. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. Ap. '42.  
 Includes bibliographies.
- Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. *Transitional period; Second report and papers presented to the Commission*. 279p. The Commission. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. Ap. '42.
- \*Condon, E. U. *Physicist's peace*. 5p. mim. The Author. Westinghouse Research Laboratories. East Pittsburgh, Pa. Mr. 24, '42.  
*Excerpts*. *American City*. 57:99. F. '42.
- Corbett, Percy E. *Post-war worlds*. 208p. (Institute of Pacific Relations Inquiry ser.) Farrar & Rinehart. N.Y. '42.
- Corbett, Percy E. *War aims and post-war plans*. 10-3p. mim. American Committee for International Studies. Princeton, N.J. '41.
- Council for Democracy. *New world*. 46p. (Democracy in Action no.9) The Council. 11 W. 42d St. N.Y. '42.  
 Bibliography. p. 44-5.
- Davies, A. Powell. *American destiny; a faith for America*. 120p. Beacon Press. Bost. '42.



- Davis, Malcolm W. *World we want*. p. 368-72. Carnegie Foundation for International Peace. 405 W. 117th St. N.Y. '41.  
Reprint from *International Conciliation*. 369:368-72. Ap. '41.
- Doman, Nicholas. *Coming age of world control; the transition to an organized world society*. 301p. Harper & Bros. N.Y. '42.
- Eagleton, Clyde. *Fundamental principles and problems*. 21p. (Problems of Post-War Reconstruction ser.) American Council on Public Affairs. 2153 Florida Av. Wash. D.C. '42.
- Falnes, Oscar J. *Future of the small states*. 21p. (Problems of Post-War Reconstruction ser.) American Council on Public Affairs. 2153 Florida Av. Wash. D.C. '42.
- Fawcett, C. B. *Bases of a world commonwealth*. 167p. Watts & Co. Lond. '41.
- Federal Union, Inc. *Resolutions proposed and adopted in its second annual convention, June 26-28, 1942*. 2p. mimeo. The Union. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y.
- Fischer, Louis. *Shape of the peace to come*. In *his Dawn of victory*. p. 223-59. Duell, Sloan & Pearce. N.Y. '42.
- Franklin, Jay; Sitterley, Eugene F.; and Saxon, O. Glenn. *After the war—what?* 16p. (Wake Up, America! no. 109) American Economic Foundation. Carnegie Hall. Cleveland, O. F. 8, '42.
- Gelber, Lionel. *Peace by power; the plain man's guide to the key issue of the war and of the post-war world*. 159p. Oxford Univ. Press. N.Y. '42.
- Holcombe, Arthur N. *Dependent areas in the post-war world*. 108p. (America Looks Ahead pamphlet series, no.4) World Peace Foundation. 40 Mt. Vernon St. Bost. O. '41.
- Hoover, Herbert and Gibson, Hugh. *Problems of lasting peace*. 295p. Doubleday, Doran & Co. Garden City, N.Y. '42.  
*Abridged*. Reader's Digest. 41:121-42. Ag. '42.
- Institute of World Affairs. *Proceedings*. 19:1-315. D. '41. *World in turmoil*. The Institute. University of Southern California. Los Angeles. '42.
- International Labour Office. *Conference of the International Labour Organisation, 1941, New York and Washington, D.C.; record of proceedings*. 201p. The Office. Montreal. '41.
- International Labour Office. *I.L.O. and reconstruction; report by the Acting Director of the International Labour Office to the Conference of the International Labour Organisation, New York, October 1941*. 112p. The Office. Montreal. '41.

- International Labour Office. Social objective in wartime and world reconstruction; New York Conference of the International Labour Organisation. 24p. The Office. Montreal. '42.  
*Reprint* from International Labour Review. Vol. 45, no. 1. Ja. '42.
- International Labour Office. Towards our true inheritance; reconstruction work of the I.L.O. 77p. International Labor Office. 734 Jackson Pl. Wash. D.C. '42.
- International Student Service. After victory what? 18p. mim. The Service. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. Mr. '42.
- International Student Service. Youth's stake in war aims and peace aims. 15p. mim. The Service. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. Ja. '42.
- Johnsen, Julia E. comp. International federation of democracies (proposed). 263p. (Reference Shelf. Vol. 14, no.8) H. W. Wilson Co. N.Y. Ap. '41.
- Jordan, Henry P. ed. Problems of post-war reconstruction. 292p. American Council on Public Affairs. Wash. D.C. '42.
- Kingsley, J. Donald and Petegorsky, David W. Strategy for democracy. 342p. Longmans, Green & Co. N.Y. '42.
- Kohn, Hans. World order in historical perspective. 352p. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Mass. '42.
- League of Nations Association. Essential facts underlying world organization. 47p. Educational Committee. The Association. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. N. '41.
- League of Nations Association. Unity of nations; recent statements by the foremost authorities. 4p. The Association. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. Ja. 10, '42.
- Muste, A. J. Wage peace now! 32p. Fellowship of Reconciliation. 2929 Broadway. N.Y. ['42.]
- National Opinion Research Center. Nation-wide survey of post-war and current problems. 29p. (Report no.5) The Center. University of Denver. Denver, Colo. Ag. '42.
- National Peace Conference. National Peace Conference—what it is and does. 6p. The Conference. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. '41.
- National Peace Conference. To prevent a third world war—world government. 8p. The Conference. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. Je. '41.
- Page, Robert F. Real peace, security and recovery. 47p. The Author. 11419 Rochester Av. West Los Angeles, Calif. '41
- Pickard, Bertram. Peacemakers' dilemma; plea for a *modus vivendi* in the peace movement. 75p. (Pam. no. 16) Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pa. Mr. '42.

- Pickard, Bertram. United States—Japan conflict. 10p. mim. Peace Section. American Friends Service Committee. 20 S. 12th St. Phila. D. 9, '41.
- Robinson, Howard, and others. Toward international organization; a series of lectures at Oberlin College. 218p. Harper & Bros. N.Y. '42.
- Schuman, Frederick L. Design for power; the struggle for the world. 324p. Alfred A. Knopf. N.Y. '42.
- Schwarzenberger, Georg P. Power politics; an introduction to the study of international relations and post-war planning. 448p. Jonathan Cape. Lond. '41.
- Staley, Eugene. This shrinking world; world technology vs. national politics; a reprint of part I of World economy in transition. 56p. World Citizens Association. 86 E. Randolph St. Chic. '41.
- Thomas, Norman. World federation; what are the difficulties? 22p. Post War World Council. 112 E. 19th St. N.Y. '42.
- \*Wallace, Henry A. Price of free world victory. 32p. L. B. Fischer. N.Y. '42.
- Speech before the Free World Association, May 8, 1942. The above edition includes comments by Raymond Clapper and others.
- Same.* International Conciliation. 381:369-76. Je. '42; Vital Speeches of the Day. 8:482-5. Je. 1, '42; Free World. 3:9-13. Je. '42; *Also* separate. 8p. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. N.Y.; 4p. World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.
- War Resisters League. Our position in wartime. 5p. The League. 2 Stone St. N.Y. D. 19, '41.
- Weis, J. Max; Thomas, Norman; and Celler, Emanuel. Is Congress blocking post-war plans? 10p. mim. (World Peaceways Forum) World Peaceways. 103 Park Av. N.Y. My. 24, '42.
- Wilson, P. W. Newtopia; the world we want. 219p. Charles Scribner's Sons. N.Y. '41.
- Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. World government and the color bar. [4]p. The League. 1924 Chestnut St. Phila. '42.
- Woodrow Wilson Foundation. Unity of nations; recent statements by the foremost authorities. [4p.] The Foundation. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. '42.
- Young, George. Federalism and freedom, or, Plan the peace to win the war. 204p. Oxford University Press. Oxford, Eng. '41.

## PERIODICALS

Accountant (England). 107:17-19, 29-31. Jl. 11-18, '42. Fallacies in reconstruction.

Agenda: a Quarterly Journal of Reconstruction.

Volume 1, number 1 issued January 1942. Published by Humphrey Milford, London, for the London School of Economics and Political Science. It essays to "deal with the whole field of reconstruction problems, domestic and international, social, political, and economic. The editor is Professor G. N. Clark, and the Advisory Committee consists of Governors and Officers of the School."

Agenda. 1:59-72. Ja. '42. "Failure" of the League of Nations. C. A. W. Manning.

American Bar Association Journal. 28:526-8. Ag. '42. Constitutional problems in the coming world federation. John H. Wigmore.

American Historical Review. 47:545-51. Ap '42. American sectionalism and world organization; ed. with introduction by W. Diamond. Frederick Jackson Turner.

American Journal of International Law. 36:229-41. Ap '42. Organization of the community of nations. Clyde Eagleton.

American Magazine. 134:16-17+. Jl. '42. What we are fighting for. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

American Scholar. 11 no.3:275-91. [Jl.] '42. International utopias. Zechariah Chafee, Jr.

American Sociological Review. 7:400-6. Je. '42. Implications of supranational federation. Lewis A. Dexter.

American Teacher. 26:21+. D. '41. A.F. of L. convention adopts resolution on post war reconstruction.

Annals of the American Academy. 222:1-132. Jl. '42. Winning both the war and the peace. Ernest Minor Patterson, ed.

\*International courts in the postwar world. Manley O. Hudson. p. 117-23.

\*Association of American Colleges Bulletin. 28:220-4. My. '42. War of civilization should follow the war of force. J. H. Reynolds.

Atlantic Monthly. 169:172-5. F. '42. Problem of reconstruction. Alfred North Whitehead.

Atlantic Monthly. 169:176-83. F. '42. How to win the peace. Thomas Mann.

Atlantic Monthly. 170:1-6. Jl. '42. Image of victory. Archibald MacLeish.

Barron's. 22:3-4. Jl. 20, '42. Peace and the post-war world; we must accept new social conditions if we are to make a lasting peace. James Truslow Adams.

- \*Bulletins from Britain. No. 93:11-13. Je. 10, '42. Labor Party's plan to win the peace.
- Business Week. p. 83. Jl. 4, '42. People, yes; to build a better world is going to require a better people.
- \*Call. 7:3. S. 11, '42. World federation. Norman Thomas.
- Christian Century. 59:75-6. Ja. 21, '42. Preparation for the peace. Oswald Garrison Villard.
- \*Christian Century. 59:467-8. Ap. 8, '42. Winning the peace; statement by several members of the Yale faculty.  
*Discussion.* 59:563-4. Ap. 29, '42.
- \*Christian Century. 59:834-5. Jl. 1, '42. Should there be a long armistice? Oswald Garrison Villard.
- Christian Science Monitor Weekly Magazine Section. p. 1-2+. My. 2, '42. Whither federation? Carlyle Morgan.
- Christian Science Monitor Weekly Magazine Section. p.3+. Jl. 3, '42. Fight to free the world. William Yandell Elliott.
- Collier's. 109:14-16+. Je. 6, '42. Maps for a new world; redesigned for lasting peace. George T. Renner.  
*Discussion.* Time. 39:25-6; 40:42+, 3-4+. Je. 15, Jl. 13, \*Ag. 3, '42.
- Common Sense. 11:189-91. Je. '42. Peace aims as war weapons. Julian S. Huxley.
- Commonweal. 36:324-6. Jl. 24, '42. Future can be ours. William Agar.
- Congressional Record. 88:A1669-71. Ap. 27, '42. Drive for a new world order. Roy O. Woodruff.
- Congressional Record. 88:5351-3. Je. 11, '42. Call for statesmanship to hasten the dawn of a better world.
- Congressional Record. 88:A2501-3. Je. 18, '42. International co-operation. Edwin C. Johnson.
- Congressional Record. 88:A2719-23. Je. 30, '42. Organization of peace. Francisco Castillo Najera.  
*Same.* Annals of the American Academy. 222:60-73. Jl. '42.
- Congressional Record. 88:A3378-9. Ag. 24, '42. Long armistice. Samuel B. Pettengill.
- Congressional Record. 88:A3391-2. Ag. 27, '42. Planning for post-war reconstruction; criticism of the Buell plan. Fred Brenckman.
- Congressional Record. 88:A3421-2. S. 3, '42. War aims are the peace terms. Kenneth McKellar.
- \*Contemporary Jewish Record. 5:123-30. Ap. '42. When peace comes; a challenge to America. Clark M. Eichelberger.

- Contemporary Review. 161:129-33. Mr. '42. League or union? George Young.
- Contemporary Review. 161:181-6. Mr. '42. War aims. George Glasgow.
- Contemporary Review. 161:193-200. Ap. '42. Freedom from fear Lord Davies.
- Current History. n.s.2:328-35. Jl. '42. America in the post-war world. J. O. Downey.
- \*Economist (London). 143:66-7. Jl. 18, '42. American challenge.
- Education for Victory. 1:22. Jl. 15, '42. Post-war world, its problems and resources. Raymond B. Fosdick.
- Foreign Commerce Weekly. 7:3-4+. Je. 6, '42. America's world role. Sumner Welles.
- Fortnightly. 157(n.s.151):132-8. F. '42. Problem of the small state. J. A. R. Marriott.
- Fortnightly. 157(n.s.151):173-80. Mr. '42. After the war, what then? Viscount Herbert Louis Samuel.
- Fortnightly. 157(n.s.151):202-8. Mr. '42. British commonwealth and colonies. Norman Bentwich.
- Fortnightly. 158(n.s.152):1-7. Jl. '42. Colonial charter. Lord Hailey.
- Fortune. 25:110-12. Ap. '42. Fortune survey; postwar world.
- Free World. 2:5-6. F. '42. Editorial; report on nine fundamental freedoms proposed by the National Resources and Planning Board.
- \*Free World. 2:211-14. Ap. '42. International police force. Lord Davies.
- Free World. 2:325-9; 3:165-9, 229-35. My. Jl.-Ag. '42. Planning of the future a weapon for the present. Louis Dolivet.
- Free World. 3:78-82. Je. '42. Power in international government. Egon Ranshofen-Wertheimer.
- Free World. 3:83-6. Je. '42. World order and cultural diversity. Lawrence K. Frank.
- Free World. 3:269-77. Ag '42. Plans for the future: Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; Department of Agriculture; Federal Union.
- \*Free World. 3:305-9. S. '42. Dangers of a false peace. Frank Kingdon.
- Free World. 3:315-23. S. '42. Colonies in a changing world. Julian Huxley

- Free World. 3:338-57. S. '42. Coming world order; round table no.10. William A. Neilson and others.
- Geographical Review. 32:436-47. Jl. '42. Frontiers, security, and international organization; the geography of power. Nicholas John Spykman.
- Harvard Educational Review. 12:121-8. Mr. '42. Democracy faces a world order. Alain Locke.
- Harvard Guardian. 6:17-21. Jl. '42. I.L.O. looks ahead. E. J. Riches.
- Hibbert Journal. 40:22-33. O. '41. Oneness of the world. Maxwell Garnett.
- Hibbert Journal. 40:140-5. Ja. '42. New and better world. Ray Knight.
- \*Horizon. 1:1-8. Jl. '42. As democracy awakens. Manly P. Hall.
- Institute of International Education News Bulletin. 17:3-5. Mr. '42. Peaceful change through supranational legislation. Stephen Duggan.
- Institute of International Education News Bulletin. 17:3-6. Ap. '42. Supranational courts. Stephen Duggan.
- International Conciliation. 379:149-279. Ap. '42. Commission to Study the Organization of Peace; Second report—the transitional period and papers presented to the Commission.
- International Labour Review. 45:1-24. Ja. '42. Social objective in wartime and world reconstruction; New York Conference of the International Labour Organisation.
- International Labour Review. 46:1-43. Jl. '42. I.L.O. and plans for a people's peace; London meeting of the Emergency Committee, April, 1942.  
Also separate. 43p. International Labour Office. Montreal. '42.
- \*Journal of Politics. 4:250-63. My. '42. Coming world order, closed or free. D. F. Fleming.
- Land and Freedom. 42:36-7. Ap. '42. Coming world government. Peter Onesti.
- Liberty. 19:18-19. F. 28, '42. Can we win the peace? George Bernard Shaw.
- Library Quarterly. 12:752-61. Jl. '42. Subsoil of peace. Henry M. Wriston.
- Magazine of Wall Street. 70:63-5+. My. 2, '42. If war is prolonged. Alexander Colvin.

- Nation. 154:704-8. Je. 20, '42. World war III? J. Alvarez Del Vayo.
- \*Nation's Schools. 29:51-2. Mr. '42. Keystone for the peace treaty. John K. Norton.
- Nature. 149:261-3. Mr. 7, '42. Science and international politics. Richard Gregory.
- Nature. 149:337-40. Mr. 28, '42. Leadership in world reconstruction.
- Nature. 149:401-2. Ap. 11, '42. Foundations of the new world order. John Orr.
- New Europe and World Reconstruction. 2:156-7. My. '42. Peace or truce? Walter Consuelo Langsam.
- New Europe and World Reconstruction. 2:224-8. Jl. '42. American public opinion in the appeasement period. Joseph S. Roucek.
- New Mexico Quarterly Review. 12:63-70. F. '42. After the war—what? Thomas C. Donnelly.
- New Republic. 105:297-300. S. 8, '41. Substitute for imperialism; rescue work on a vast international scale.
- New Republic. 106:163-84. F. 2, '42. Lessons of last time. George Soule.
- \*New Republic. 106:566-8. Ap. 27, '42. Job for American higher education. Julian S. Huxley.
- New Republic. 107:119-20. Jl. 27, '42. Winning the peace. G. W. Norris.
- New York Times. p. 4. F. 24, '42. Address to nation on America's progress in the war. Franklin D. Roosevelt.
- New York Times. p. 3E. Je. 21, '42. Plan of long armistice finds scant opposition. Arthur Krock.
- New York Times. p. 8E. Jl. 19, '42. Peace plans necessary; ground-work laid now might be means of shortening war. Clyde Eagleton.
- \*New York Times. p. 9E. Ag. 30, '42. Reconstruction. Waldemar Kaempffert.
- New York Times Book Review. p. 1+. Je. 21, '42. When we rebuild the world; review of Problems of lasting peace, by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson. Anne O'Hare McCormick.
- Same. Congressional Record. 88:A2745-6. Je. 30, '42.
- Newsweek. 19:12. My. 11, '42. Blueprint for a better world.
- Newsweek. 19:32. Je. 1, '42. More blueprints for a new world; recent speeches on war and peace aims. Ernest K. Lindley.



- Newsweek. 19:27-8. Je. 15, '42. Lend-lease policy employed to plan peace when it comes.
- Newsweek. 19:54. Je. 29, '42. Proposed postwar cooling off period. Ralph Robey.
- \*Political Science Quarterly. 57:128-9. Mr. '42. Peace aims: a specific proposal. Lynn Thorndike.
- Rotarian. 59:8-9. S.; 7. O.; 9-13. N.; 8-11+. D. '41; 60:8-11+. Ja.; 14-15. F.; 8-12. Mr.; 10-12. Ap.; 10-13. My.; 28-30+. Je.; 61:10-12. Jl.; 10-12. Ag. '42. World to live in; problems of post-war reconstruction; symposium.
- Titles are: Bases for a lasting peace. H. G. Wells; After the war, what then? Walter D. Head; Help science outmode war! Harrison E. Howe; Pantry door to peace. Paul V. McNutt; Americas show the way. Walter B. Pitkin; My 7 points for a new world order. Mohandas K. Gandhi; Shall the next peace also fail? Norman Angell; No more empires! F. W. Sollmann; Economic highways of the Americas. Edward Tomlinson; Inter-American unity is possible. Ricardo J. Alfaro; What's ahead for small business in the U.S.A.? Stuart Chase; My faith in the future. Henry Ford.
- Saturday Evening Post. 214:9-10+. Ap. 18, '42. For what are we fighting? Felix Morley.
- School and Society. 56:57-60. Jl. 18, '42. American traditions and world problems. Frank Aydelotte.
- Science News Letter. 41:182. Mr. 21, '42. Blueprint for world peace needed now, say scientists.
- Social Research. 9:159-68. My. '42. Coming organization for peace. Alvin Johnson.
- Social Science. 17:260-6. Jl. '42. Some problems connected with the forthcoming peace. George A. Finch.
- Sociology and Social Research. 26:460-4. My. '42. War aims. Emory S. Bogradus.
- South Atlantic Quarterly. 41:1-17. Ja. '42. War aims and peace proposals. René Albrecht-Carrié.
- Statist (London). 139:385-6, 426-7, 456-7. My. 23, Je. 6, 20, '42. Future. George Paish.
- \*Survey Graphic. 31:295. Je. '42. Fight for the future; the civilian's responsibility for the peace. Michael Straight.
- \*Survey Graphic. 31:309-11+. Jl. '42. Power and the peacemakers. Vera Micheles Dean.
- \*Theosophist (Adyar). 63:426-9. Mr. '42. Theosophy and reconstruction. C. Jinarajadasa.
- Thought. 17:211-30. Je. '42. Strategy of the coming peace. Friedrich Baerwald.

Time. 39:56. Ja. 19, '42. Geopolitics in college.

Time. 39:10. Je. 15, '42. Stassen's seven points; post-war plan.

\*Time. 40:3-4+. Ag. 3, '42. Map of the future. Ellsworth Huntington.

Tomorrow. 1:4-8. Je. '42. Minimum program for a free order. Salvador De Madariaga.

Town Meeting (Bulletin of America's Town Meeting of the Air). 7, no. 26:1-45. Ap. 20, '42. What are the essentials of a lasting peace? Clark M. Eichelberger, Henry J. Allen, and Harry D. Gideonse; and What economic sacrifices must we make for a lasting peace? Clark M. Eichelberger, Joseph C. O'Mahoney, and A.D.H. Kaplan.

United States. Department of State. Bulletin. 6:452-65. My. 23, '42. Why are we fighting and for what? Stanley K. Hornbeck.

United States. Department of State. Bulletin. 7:601-13. Jl. 11, '42. Mutual-aid agreements.

Texts of agreements with Greece, The Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, and Norway.

United States. Department of State. Bulletin. 7:639-47. Jl. 25, '42. War and human freedom. Cordell Hull.

Same. Seriousness of the war; post-war plans to safeguard peace; radio address, July 23, 1942. *Vital Speeches of the Day*. 8:610-14. Ag. 1, '42.

United States News. 12:14-15. Je. 5, '42. Planning postwar world: Mr. Hull vs. Mr. Wallace.

United States News. 12:20-1. Je. 19, '42. Peace conference—new style. David Lawrence.

University of Chicago Round Table. 229:1-20. Ag. 2, '42. Should we discuss the next peace now? Percy W. Bidwell, R. P. McKeon, and Ralph Barton Perry.

University of Chicago Round Table. 230:1-23. Ag. 9, '42. Post-war world; political reconstruction. Norman Angell, Avery O. Craven, and Philip Jessup.

Vital Speeches of the Day. 8:254-5. F. 1, '42. America and the world crisis; can we also win the peace? D. F. Fleming.

Vital Speeches of the Day. 8:429-33. My. 1, '42. Americas in the world crisis; basic human rights. Donald A. MacLean.

Vital Speeches of the Day. 8:514-16. Je. 15, '42. World leadership to protect peace; address, Arlington National Amphitheatre, May 30, 1942. Sumner Welles.

Also separate. Post-war specifications. 8p. Woodrow Wilson Foundation. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y.

- Vital Speeches of the Day. 8:533-6. Je. 15. '42. Future world order; ideal of the United Nations. Dorothy Thompson.
- Vital Speeches of the Day. 8:610-14. Ag. 1, '42. Seriousness of the war; radio address, July 23, 1942. Cordell Hull.
- Excerpts.* Time. 40:15+. Ag. 3, '42; United States News. 13:20-1. Jl. 31, '42.
- Vital Speeches of the Day. 8:633-5. Ag. 1, '42. Building in war for peace. Dean Acheson.
- Also separate.* 6p. mim. The Author. Dept. of State. Wash. D.C. Speech before the Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia, July 6, 1942.
- World Affairs. 105:34-6. Mr. '42. Possible reorganization of the League of Nations. Benjamin Gerig.
- World Alliance News Letter. 18:4-5. Je '42. Towards a new brotherhood.
- Yale Review. n.s.31, no.3:433-53. [Mr.] '42. Making democracy safe in the world. Carl Becker.

### THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

- Bulletin; the Council for Social Service, the Church of England. no.105:1-23. F. 14, '42. Atlantic Charter, the war and Christian responsibility.
- Bulletin of the Pan American Union. 76:324-7. Je. '42. Atlantic Charter; address, Rio de Janeiro, January 24, 1942. Gabriel Turbay.
- Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. Bulletin. 2:1-12. Jl. '42. United Nations' agreements and documents; notes on organizations; bibliographical notes.
- Includes texts of: United Nations Joint Declaration; Mexican Adherence; Philippine Adherence; Atlantic Charter; Four Freedoms; Resolution F, International Labor Organization Conference, New York, 1941; Resolution xxxv, Rio de Janeiro Conference; Inter-Allied Agreement, June 12, 1941; Inter-Allied Agreement, September 24, 1941; Joint Declaration of Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, and Yugoslavia, January 14, 1942; Central and Eastern European Planning Board; Polish-Czechoslovak Agreement, November 11, 1940; Polish-Czechoslovak Declaration, January 25, 1942; Soviet-Polish Agreement, July 30, 1941; Soviet-Polish Agreement, December 4, 1941; Anglo-Soviet Agreement, July 12, 1941; Anglo-Soviet Agreement, June 11, 1942; Treaty of Alliance between United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and Iran, January 29, 1942; Greek-Yugoslav Agreement, January 15, 1942.
- Contemporary Review. 161:1-8. Ja. '42. Thoughts on the Atlantic Charter. Viscount Herbert Louis Samuel.
- Contemporary Review. 161:17-21. Ja. '42. Future of the small nations. Emile Cammaerts.
- Contemporary Review. 161:264-8. My. '42. Atlantic Charter No.2: article 7 of the 1942 agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States of America. George Peel.

- \*Free World. 1:368-70. Ja. '42. Weak point in the Atlantic Charter. Henry Laugier.
- Johnsen, Julia E. comp. Eight-points of post-war world reorganization. 126p. (Reference Shelf. Vol. 15, no. 5) H. W. Wilson Co. N.Y. Mr. '42.
- L.I.D. [League for Industrial Democracy] News Bulletin. 8:13-19. Ja. '42. Atlantic Charter; a bibliography and some comments.
- New Europe and World Reconstruction. 2:192-6. Je. '42. Atlantic Charter (Article V) and East-Central Europe. Adam Giolkosz.
- New Europe and World Reconstruction. 2:228-9. Jl. '42. Undermining the Atlantic Charter; Renner geopolitical views. Stephen De Ropp.
- New York Times. p. 3E. Je. 14, '42. Atlantic Charter saved in its first great crisis. Arthur Krock.
- Newsweek. 20:28. Ag. 3, '42. No honey for the drones; Secretary Hull's speech. Ernest K. Lindley.
- Political Quarterly. 13:144-59. Ap. '42. Atlantic Charter. W. Arnold-Forster.
- Social Education. 6:58-65. F. '42. Roosevelt-Churchill declaration and the terms of a future peace. Bernadotte E. Schmitt.
- Vital Speeches of the Day. 8:312-18. Mr. 1, '42. Roosevelt-Churchill declaration. Bernadotte E. Schmitt.
- Watson, Harry. Historic significance of the Roosevelt-Churchill conference. 9p. mim. Committee for the Preservation of the Jews. 381 Van Siclen Av. Brooklyn, N. Y. S. 19, '41.
- Woodrow Wilson Foundation. Woodrow Wilson's fourteen points; the Atlantic Charter's eight points. 4p. The Foundation. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. F. 17, '42.
- World Citizens Association. Surveys on the basic issues of post-war peace; eleventh survey: How can the Roosevelt-Churchill Eight-Point Declaration be strengthened and make an effective force in building a just and stable world? 19p. mim. The Association. 86 E. Randolph St. Chicago. '42.

## THE DEMOCRACIES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

### BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Bonnet, Henri. United Nations; what they are, what they may become. 100p. World Citizens Association. 84 E. Randolph St. Chic. '42.
- Curtis, Lionel. Action. 71p. Oxford Univ. Press. Lond. '42.
- Curtis, Lionel. Decision. 76p. Oxford Univ. Press. Lond. '42.

- MacCormac, John. America and world mastery; the future of the United States, Canada, and the British Empire. 338p. Duell, Sloan and Pearce. N.Y. '42.
- MacFarlane, R. O. Beginning at the end; Canada and the post-war world. 24p. (Behind the Headlines. Vol. 2, no.5) Canadian Institute of International Affairs. 3 Willcocks St. Toronto. F. 15, '42.
- Reading list. p. 24.
- MacFarlane, R. O. Blueprints for a new world; Canada and the post-war world. 23p. (Behind the Headlines. Vol. 3, no.4) Canadian Institute of International Affairs. 3 Willcocks St. Toronto. F. 1, '42.
- Reading list. p. 23.
- MacFarlane, R. O. Canada tomorrow; Canada and the post-war world. 24p. (Behind the Headlines. Vol. 2, no.3) Canadian Institute of International Affairs. 3 Willcocks St. Toronto. Ja. '42.
- Reading list. p. 24.
- Peace aims; British official statements; a chronological record, from September 2, 1939 to September 24, 1941. 30p. British Library of Information. 30 Rockefeller Plaza. N.Y. '42.
- Shepardson, Whitney Hart. Interests of the United States as a world power. 64p. Claremont Colleges. Claremont, Calif. '42.
- Spykman, Nicholas John. America's strategy in world politics; the United States and the balance of power. 500p. Harcourt, Brace & Co. N.Y. '42.
- United nations fight for the four freedoms. 15p. Office of War Information. Wash. D.C. '42.
- War and peace aims; a digest of official statements of the belligerent nations in the Second World War. 34p. mime. Conference Department. International Student Service. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. Ja. '42.

#### PERIODICALS

- Agenda. 1:86-91. Ja. '42. Surveys of research work; British domestic reconstruction. C. H. Wilson.
- American Bar Association Journal. 28:545. Ag. '42. War for preservation of humanity. Owen J. Roberts.
- American Scholar. 11, no.1:45-8. [Ja.] '42. England and the English-speaking people. John Erskine.
- Discussion. American Scholar. 11, no. 2:249-51. [Ap.] '42.
- Annals of the American Academy. 220:193-9. Mr. '42. Purpose of America. David Cushman Coyle.

- Canadian Forum. 22:10-12. Ap. '42. Anglo-American dream? F. H. Underhill.
- Foreign Policy Reports. 18:94-107. Jl. 1, '42. Machinery of collaboration between the United Nations. Payson S. Wild, Jr.
- Fortune. 25:Sup. 1-21. My. '42. United States in a new world; series of reports on potential courses for democratic action; I. Relations with Britain.
- Free World. 2:218-20. Ap. '42. United Nations; blueprint for the future. Henri Bonnet.
- Free World. 2:330-42. My. '42. United Nations; round table no 7. Michael Straight and others.
- Free World. 2:343-4. My '42. May, month for the United Nations. Clark M. Eichelberger.
- Free World. 2:363-6. My '42. Canada's place in the war and after. Leslie Roberts.
- Free World. 3:366-72. S. '42. Plans for the future: British Labor Party; Institute of Pacific Relations.
- Frontiers of Democracy. 8:230-45. My. '42. New bill of rights; objectives for post-war planning developed by the National Resources Planning Board. Norton E. Long and others.
- International Labour Review. 46:173-8. Ag. '42. British and American reconstruction policy.  
Includes excerpts from statements by Anthony Eden, Sumner Welles and John G. Winant; Agreements [with China and Soviet Russia] implementing the Atlantic Charter; and, Reconstruction work of the Czechoslovak government in exile.
- Nation. 154:336-9. Mr. 21, '42. Headaches in post-war planning; disparity in principle between different government planning groups. Maxwell S. Stewart.
- New Republic. 107:47-9. Jl. 13, '42. New isolationism. Richard Lee Strout.
- Pacific Affairs. 15:133-53. Je. '42. Australia in the United Nations. G. W. Warnecke.
- \*Southwestern Social Science Quarterly. 22:317-23. Mr. '42. America looks beyond the war; post-war plans of government agencies. Joseph Hirsch and Leonard Allen.
- University of Chicago Round Table. 222:1-29. Je. 14, '42. United Nations. Norman Angell, Louis Gottschalk, and Frederick Schuman.
- World Affairs. 105:28-32. Mr. '42. Anglo-American federation. Theodore Marburg.

## REGIONAL PROBLEMS

## AFRICA

- Amerasia. 6:275-86. Ag. '42. Modern policy for Africa. Kate L. Mitchell.
- Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims. Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American standpoint. 164p. The Committee. 101 Park Av. N.Y. '42.

## ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

- Amerasia. 6:83-5. Ap. '42. Meaning of a Pacific charter. Joaquin M. Elizalde.
- Amerasia. 6:161-5. Je. '42. Charter for Asia. Philip J. Jaffe.
- American Mercury. 55:72-81. Jl. '42. Asia for the Asiatics? George E. Sokolsky.
- Asia. 42:146-50. Mr. '42. Union now with India; Asia for whom? Lin Yutang.
- Asia. 42:153-5. Mr. '42. Tinder for Asia. Pearl S. Buck.  
*Also separate.* Buck, Pearl S. Freedom for all. p. 3-12. Post War World Council. 112 E. 19th St. N.Y. *Also separate.* Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church. 10p. 740 Rush St. Chicago.
- Asia. 42:177-9. Mr. '42. World war, world charter. Fritz Sternberg.
- Asia. 42:263-6. My. '42. Peace has to be enforced. Hu Shih.
- Asia. 42:398-9. Jl. '42. Peace aims in the Pacific; statement on question of postwar settlements in East Asia. H. J. Temperley.  
*Discussion.* Asia. 42:464-5+. Ag. '42.
- Asia. 42:416-18. Jl. '42. Asians ask some questions. Haridas T. Muzumdar.
- Atlantic Monthly. 169:533-7. My '42. China emergent. Madame Chiang Kai-Shek.
- Christian Century. 59:998-9. Ag. 19, '42. Postwar Pacific.
- Christian Science Monitor Weekly Magazine Section. p. 1-2+. Ap. 25, '42. What we are fighting for in the Orient. Pearl S. Buck.
- Common Sense. 11:79-82. Mr. '42. How to mobilize the Far East; half the human race can be brought within the democratic system, if our peace aims are democratic. Harry Paxton Howard.
- \*Common Sense. 11:242-3. Jl. '42. Wanted: a Pacific charter. Harry Paxton Howard.
- Congressional Record. 88:A2863-4. Jl. 9, '42. Far East: a glimpse into the future; address, Charlottesville, July 7, 1942. Elbert D. Thomas.

- Economist (London). 142:386-7. Mr. 21, '42. East and west.
- Far Eastern Survey. 11:135-7. Je. 15, '42. New international commonwealth? recent mutual aid agreements. Kurt Bloch.
- Foreign Affairs. 20:694-704. Jl. '42. Fight for democracy in Asia. Owen Lattimore.
- Free World. 2:9-13. F. '42. For a just peace in the Pacific. Hu Shih.
- Free World. 2:228-49. Ap. '42. Essentials of victory in the Far East, round table no. 6. Nathaniel Peffer and others.
- New Republic. 106:761-2. Je. 1, '42. Total victory; we must revise our attitude toward peoples of India and China. Pearl S. Buck.
- New York Times Magazine. p. 3-4+. My. 31, '42. Race barrier that must be destroyed. Pearl S. Buck.
- New York Times Magazine. p. 9+. Jl. 5, '42. Equal rights for Asia, too. Francis B. Sayre.

## PAN AMERICA

- Daniel, Hawthorne. North America: wheel of the future. 300p. Charles Scribner's Sons. N.Y. '42.
- Free World. 2:317-19. My. '42. Continental solidarity and international organization. Charles G. Fenwick.
- Green, Phil Leonard. Pan American progress. 214p. Hastings House. N.Y. '42.
- Laves, Walter H. C. Inter-American solidarity. 278p. University of Chicago Press. Chic. '41.
- Round Table (London). 126:242-54. Mr. '42. Latin America and the future.
- School and Society. 55:457-62. Ap. 25, '42. This hemispheric problem. Paul R. Hanna.
- Southwestern Social Science Quarterly. 22:310-16. Mr. '42. Geographic stumbling block to new world unity. J. W. Reid.
- Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Hands across the Americas; program for implementing the good neighbor policy between the United States and Latin America. 9p. mim. The League. 1924 Chestnut St. Phila. '41.
- Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Plan for Western Hemisphere relations. The League. 1924 Chestnut St. Phila. My. '41.
- References for further study. Appendix, p. 1-4.



## RECONSTRUCTION IN EUROPE

## BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Future of Germany. 16p. (Broadcast no. 172) Political and Economic Planning. 16 Queen Anne's Gate. Lond. S.W. 1. '41.
- Guérard, Albert Léon. France of tomorrow. 287p. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Mass. '42.
- Huxley, Julian. Reconstruction and peace. 47p. New Republic. 40 E. 49th St. N.Y. '42.
- Pakstas, Kazys. Baltoscandian confederation. 28p. Lithuanian Cultural Institute. 2334 S. Oakley Av. Chicago. Mr. '42.
- Polish declaration of human rights. 2p. (Poland Fights no.21) Polish Labor Group. 55 W. 42d St. N.Y. Ag. 28, '41.
- Raestad, Arnold. Europe and the Atlantic world. 32p. mime. American Committee for International Studies. Princeton, N.J. '41.
- Schairer, Reinhold. Educational reconstruction in Europe after Hitler. 24p. United States Committee on Educational Reconstruction. 2 W. 45th St. N.Y. '41.
- Tillich, Paul. War aims. 22p. Protestant. 521 5th Av. N.Y. ['42?]
- Weinfeld, Abraham. Towards a United States of Europe; proposals for a basic structure. 52p. American Council on Public Affairs. 2153 Florida Av. Wash. D.C. '42.

## PERIODICALS

- Central European Observer. 19:151-2. My. 15, '42. Future of the small nations and the idea of federation. Eduard Benes.
- Christian Science Monitor. 34:16. Ag. 22, '42. Post-war Balkan union? Norton Webb.
- Christian Science Monitor Weekly Magazine Section. p. 1-2. Jl. 11, '42. Europe must be re-educated for peace. Eduard Benes.
- Christianity and Crisis. 2:2-5. Je. 1, '42. Small nations and European reconstruction. Philip E. Mosely.
- Congressional Record. 88:A2998-9. Jl. 16, '42. Danubian reconstruction. Otto, Archduke of Austria.
- Contemporary Review. 161:72-8. F. '42. Germany after the war. Veit Valentin.
- Current History. n.s. 2:1-5. Mr. '42. What shall we do with Germany? James K. Pollock.

- Current History. n.s. 2:153-4. Ap. '42. Mutual-aid agreement between the United States and Great Britain, February 23, 1942.
- Same. Foreign Policy Reports. 18:108. Jl. 1, '42; Same with analysis. International Conciliation. 380:295-9. My. '42.
- Economist (London). 142:94-5. Ja. 24, '42. European federations. Foreign Policy Reports. 18:1-12. Mr. 15, '42. European agreements for post-war reconstruction. Vera Micheles Dean.
- Includes the following texts: Declaration by United Nations, January 1, 1942; Four freedoms by President Roosevelt, January 6, 1942; Resolution of Allied governments, June 12, 1941; Atlantic Charter, August 14, 1941; Polish-Czechoslovak declaration, November 11, 1940; Polish-Czechoslovak agreement, January 23, 1942; Russian-Polish treaty, July 30, 1941; Russian-Polish declaration, December 4, 1941; Greek-Yugoslav agreement, January 15, 1942; and Declaration of Central European and Balkan delegations of government, employers' and workers' delegates at I.L.O. conference, November 4, 1941.
- Fortnightly. 157 (n.s. 151):267-75. Ap. '42. Introduction to Soviet-British collaboration. H. Foster Anderson.
- Fortnightly. 158 (n.s. 152):24-30. Jl. '42. Democracy on the Danube. Danubian, pseud.
- Free Europe (London). 5:84. Mr. 13, '42. Russia and post-war settlement. Cecil F. Melville.
- Free Europe (London). 5:86-7. Mr. 13, '42. Transfer of populations. Bernard Newman.
- Free Europe (London). 5:118. Ap. 10, '42. Federative belt of free nations. Cecil F. Melville.
- Free World. 1:359-61. Ja. '42. Social war; a federation of Central Europe. Jan Stanczyke.
- Free World. 3:74-7. Je. '42. Central European problem. Julius Deutsch.
- Great Britain and the East. 58:8. Ja. 17, '42. Allied conference on Nazi crimes. John M. Bee.
- Harvard Law Review. 55:561-94. F. '42. European federation—the democratic alternative. Arnold Brecht.
- International Labour Review. 45:421. Ap. '42. Reconstruction programme of the British Labour Party.
- International Labour Review. 45:422-5. Ap. '42. European reconstruction planning.
- International Labour Review. 45:532-4. My. '42. Reconstruction planning agencies in various countries.
- Nation. 154:570-3. My. 16, '42. Central European federation. Milan Hodza.

- New Europe and World Reconstruction. 2:229-34. Jl. '42. Principle of self-determination. Jozef Sulkowski.
- New Europe and World Reconstruction. 2:262-8. Ag. '42. Atlantic Charter and the principle of self-determination. Jozef Sulkowski.
- New Europe and World Reconstruction. 2:268-9. Ag. '42. Psychological reconstruction in post-war Europe. Gustav Bychowski.
- New York Times. p. 18. S. 3, '42. European terror forecast; worse outrages expected as Nazis are driven from occupied lands. James A. Michener.
- Nineteenth Century. 131:241-54. Je. '42. Great Britain, France, and the balance of power.
- Nineteenth Century. 132:1-14. Jl. '42. Federal union. Fritz August Voigt.
- Saturday Evening Post. 215:11+. Ag. 8, '42. Will peace bring a United States of Eastern Europe? Eric Knight.
- Voice of Austria (Ottawa). 1:2-3. Ap. '42. Disarming Germany? Franz Klein.

## RELIGIOUS STATEMENTS ON RECONSTRUCTIONS AND PEACE

### BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- \*American Friends Service Committee. Pacifist living—today and tomorrow. 80p. The Committee. Peace Section. 20 S. 12th St. Phila. Mr. '41.
- Resolution of the Malvern Conference. p. 39-45. *Same*. Christian Century. 58:253-5. F. 19, '41.
- Atkinson, Henry A. Churches, the war and the peace. 10p. Church Peace Union. 70 5th Av. N.Y. Ja. '42.
- Church Peace Union. Report of the general secretary and the auditors for the year 1941. 34p. The Union. 70 5th Av. N.Y. Ja. 15, '42.
- Churches and a just and durable peace; handbook for the use of classes and discussion groups; findings of the National Study Conference at Delaware, Ohio, March 3-5, 1942. 80p. Christian Century Press. 407 S. Dearborn St. Chic. '42.
- Recommended reading, p. 78-80.
- Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Church. When hostilities cease; addresses and findings of the Exploratory Conference on the Bases of a Just and Enduring Peace, Chicago Temple, May 27-30, 1941. 127p. The Commission. 740 Rush St. Chic. '41.
- Bibliography. p. 125-7.

- Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace. Just and durable peace. 64p. The Commission. 8 W. 40th St. N.Y. '41. Includes: Principles of a just and durable peace recommended by responsible Christian leaders, and, current proposals regarding a new world order.
- Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace. Message from the National Study Conference on the Churches and a Just and Durable Peace, convened at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, March 3-5, 1942. 31p. The Commission. 297 4th Av. N.Y. '42.
- Council for Social Service of the Church of England in Canada. Atlantic Charter, the war and Christian responsibility. 24p. (Bul. no. 105) The Council. The Church House. 604 Jarvis St. Toronto 5. F. 14, '42. Includes Atlantic Charter and Christian concern. C. E. Silcox; Religious backgrounds of the Atlantic Charter. W. W. Judd; and a compendium.
- Eagan, James M. Pope's peace program and the U.S. 32p. (Christian Democracy series no.4) Paulist Press. 401 W. 59th St. N.Y.
- Heath, Paul Silas. Christians face the postwar world. 31p. Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States of America. Witherspoon Bldg. Phila. '42.
- Knox, John, ed. Religion and the present crisis. 165p. Univ. of Chicago Press. Chic. '42.
- Message from the National Study Conference on the Churches and a Just and Durable Peace, convened at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, March 3-5, 1942. 31p. Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace. 297 4th Av. N.Y. '42.
- O'Donnell, Charles, ed. World society; a joint report. 48p. Catholic Association for International Peace. 1312 Massachusetts Av. N.W. Wash. D.C. '41.
- Pope, Liston. Religious proposals for world order; analysis of thirty-four statements. 23p. Church Peace Union and World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches. 70 5th Av. N.Y. D. '41.
- Van Kirk, Walter W. Religion and the world of tomorrow. 150p. Willett, Clark & Co. Chic. '41.

## PERIODICALS

- Catholic World. 155:20-8. Ap. '42. Christian unity prerequisite of lasting peace. Joseph Conrad Fehr.
- Christian Century. 59:104-6. Ja. 28, '42. After Malvern; social aims for the post-war world. . . .

- Christian Century. 59:139-41. F. 4, '42. What kind of peace? Walter W. Van Kirk.
- Christian Century. 59:209-11. F. 18, '42. Revolution or counter-revolution? John C. Bennett.
- Christian Century. 59:691-3. My. 27, '42. Things which make for peace. Ernest Fremont Tuttle.
- Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. Bulletin. 2:1-23. Ja.-F. '42. Digest of religious statements on peace and post-war reconstruction.
- \*Contemporary Jewish Record. 5:357-72. Ag. '42. Religious groups and the postwar period. Louis Minsky.
- Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Information Service. 21:[1-4]. Mr. 21, '42. Delaware conference [summary of findings].
- International Labour Review. 45:535-7. My. '42. Protestant churches in Great Britain and the United States and reconstruction.
- New Europe and World Reconstruction. 2:152-5. My. '42. Pius XII and peace aims. Luigi Sturzo.
- Social Action. 8:1-44. Je. 15, '42. Christian faith and world order. Robert L. Calhoun.
- Studies (Dublin). 31:145-54. Je. '42. Pope and peace. P. J. Gannon.

## ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

### BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

- Chase, Stuart. Road we are traveling, 1914-1942; guide lines to America's future. 106p. Twentieth Century Fund. N.Y. '42.
- Condliffe, J. B. Agenda for a postwar world. 232p. W. W. Norton & Co. N.Y. '42.
- Review.* New York Times Book Review. p. 5. Ag. 30, '42. World economy after the war. Wallace R. Deuel.
- Corey, Lewis. Unfinished task; economic reconstruction for democracy. 314p. Viking Press N.Y. '42.
- De Wolf, Eric. Another temporary or a permanent peace? 34p. The Author. 48 Wall St. N.Y. '42.
- Dressler, Wymer. Post-war international trade. 46p. Cockle Printing Co. Omaha, Neb. '42.
- Dutch, Oswald, pseud. Economic peace aims; a basis for discussion. Edward Arnold & Co. Lond. '41.

- League for Industrial Democracy. Economics of defense and reconstruction; proceedings of 27th summer conference, June 20-27, 1941. 48p. The League. 112 E. 19th St. N.Y. '41.
- Littell, John McGregor. Post war planning. 45p. mim. (Littell Digest no.23) The Author. South Orange, N.J.
- Lorwin, Lewis L. Economic consequences of the second World war. 510p. Random House. N.Y. '41.
- Pasvolsky, Leo. Problem of economic peace after the war; address, Delaware, Ohio, March 4, 1942. 22p. Supt. of Doc. Wash. D.C.
- Staley, Eugene. Wartime and peacetime economic collaboration. 22p. mim. American Committee for International Studies. Princeton, N.J. '41.
- Torpatz, John. Economic basis for world peace. 222p. John Felsberg. N.Y. '41.
- Wilson, Charles E. Can we save free enterprise. 8p. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 405 W. 117th St. N.Y. F. '42.

#### PERIODICALS

- American Economic Review. 32:Sup. 165-8. Mr. '42. Basic issues in postwar international economic relations. Robert B. Bryce.
- American Economic Review. 32:Sup. 195-205. Mr. '42. Problem of exchange systems in the postwar world. Howard S. Ellis.
- \*Common Sense. 11:115-18. Ap. '42. Toward a durable peace; famous economist looks at the war as the generator of a possible world order. Eugene Staley.
- Also separate.* 4p. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 405 W. 117th St. N.Y.
- \*Engineer (London). 173:470-1. Je. 5, '42. Reconstruction; fourteen submissions made by the Federation of British Industries.
- Engineering (London). 153:454-6, 476-7, 496-7. Je. 5-19, '42. Reconstruction; report of the Federation of British Industries.
- Foreign Affairs. 20:450-65. Ap. '42. Equal access to raw materials. André Istel.
- Foreign Affairs. 20:466-76. Ap. '42. Economic tasks of the postwar world. Alvin H. Hansen and C. P. Kindleberger.
- Excerpts.* Trusts and Estates. 74:367-8. Ap. '42.
- Foreign Commerce Weekly. 8:3+. Ag. 8, '42. Federation of British Industries cites problems of reconstruction.

- Fortnightly. 158(n.s. 152):17-23. Jl. '42. British industries look ahead; Reconstruction report by the Federation of British Industries. John Sankey, 1st viscount.
- Fortune. 25:58-63. My. '42. American proposal; room for democracy and economic freedom in a shrunken world if we agree with Britain to let it expand.
- Free World. 2:223-7. Ap. '42. Farmers' problem in a democracy. L. K. Elmhirst.
- Great Britain and the East. 58:5. Ap. 11, '42. Can we share out world trade?
- Great Britain and the East. 58:8. Ap. 18, '42. Pacific charter for the East. John M. Bee.
- Harper's Magazine. 184:126-33. Ja. '42. Warning to peace-planners; America's new industrial rivals. C. Hartley Grattan.
- International Labour Review. 45:420-1. Ap. '42. Anglo-American agreement implementing the Atlantic Charter.
- Journal of Business. University of Iowa. 22:3-22. Ap. '42. Introduction to the problem of post-war economic organization.
- Nature. 149:311-13. Mr. 21, '42. International economic equilibrium.
- New Europe and World Reconstruction. 2:158-65. My. '42. Economic foundations of peace. Michael A. Heilperin.
- Southern Economic Journal. 9:46-52. Jl. '42. Post-war international economic order. Allen J. Bonnell.
- University of Chicago Round Table. 231:1-23. Ag. 16, '42. Economic requisites of a durable peace. Stuart Chase, Mordecai Ezekiel, and T. O. Yntema.
- Virginia Quarterly Review. 18, no.1:72-83. [Ja.] '42. Planning the war for peace. Helen Hill.  
*Also separate.* 16p. National Policy Committee.
- Vital Speeches of the Day. 8:557-61. Jl. 1, '42. Confidence must replace fear; importance of efficiency in production and distribution. Thurman W. Arnold.





# UNIVERSITY DEBATORS' ANNUALS

E. M. PHELPS, Ed. Cloth. Price \$2.25

Series of year books, each a collection of representative intercollegiate debates on important questions of the day. Constructive and rebuttal speeches for both sides. Each debate is accompanied by selected bibliography and briefs.

## Vol. XXVIII. 1941-1942.

Federal Incorporation of Labor Unions; A League of Nations; Military Training; Failure of Colleges to Meet Student Needs; A Federation of Democracies Based on the Churchill-Roosevelt Principles; A Federal Sales Tax; Compulsory Saving; Post-War Reconstruction; Western Hemisphere Solidarity; Freedom of Speech in Time of National Emergency.

## Vol. XXVII. 1940-1941.

Industry Can Solve the Employment Problem; Conscription of Capital for Defense; Preservation of Democracy Through Decreased Government Control; Interstate Trade Barriers; Japanese Aggression; Union of United States and British Commonwealth of Nations; Regulation of the American Press; Compulsory Military Training; Strikes in Defense Industries; Western Hemisphere Defense.

## Vol. XXVI. 1939-1940.

The Basis of a Lasting Peace; Shall the United States Enter the War?; Government Ownership and Operation of Railroads; Neutrality of the United States; Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements; The Third Term for President; Should the Roosevelt Administration Be Approved?; The Dies Committee; Civil Liberties; Labor; Foreign Affairs; Government and Business.

## Vol. XXV. 1938-1939.

The Increase in the National Debt; The Anglo-American Alliance; Government Ownership and Operation of the Railroads; Alliance of United States, France and Great Britain Against Fascism; Have the Achievements of Science Brought Progress?; American Solidarity; The Problem of Unemployment; The American Newspaper; "Pump-priming" Should Cease; Government and Health.

## Vol. XXIV. 1937-1938.

Democracy and Economic Prosperity; American Isolation from European Affairs; Protection of United States Citizens on Foreign Soil; Academic Freedom; Grades and Final Tests Subversive of the Aims of Higher Education; American League of Nations; Anglo-American Mutual Assistance Pact; N.L.R.A. and Arbitration of Industrial Disputes; Unicameral Legislatures; Uniform Marriage Laws; Regulation of Advertising.

## Vol. XXIII. 1936-1937.

The Constitution a Menace; Government Ownership of Electric Utilities; Subsidizing College Athletes; Teachers' Oaths; Unicameral Legislatures; Economic Internationalism; Minimum Wages and Maximum Hours (two debates); Consumers' Cooperatives; The Present-day Family as a Social Institution; The Sit-down Strike.

## Vol. XXII. 1935-1936.

A Written Constitution a Hindrance to Social Progress; State Medicine; Compulsory Military Training; Legalization of Sweepstakes; Admission of Negroes to State Universities; The Neutrality Policy of the United States; The Parole System; Admission of Hawaii as a State; Limitation of the Power of the Supreme Court (two debates).

## Vol. XXI. 1934-1935.

Equalizing Educational Opportunity; An Evaluation of the New Deal; Social Services and Unemployment Relief; International Traffic in Arms and Munitions; Democratic Collectivism; The Agricultural Adjustment Administration; Collective Bargaining; Government Ownership and Operation of Public Utilities; Pacifism the Highest Form of Patriotism; Japan and Naval Parity.

## Vol. XX. 1933-1934.

British System of Radio Control and Operations; Armed Intervention; Japanese Policy in the Far East; A Department of the Consumer in the President's Cabinet; University of Chicago Plan of Education; Economic Reconstruction; Increasing the Powers of the President; Socialized Medicine; Freer Trade; Problem of State Liquor Control.

## Vol. XIX. 1932-1933.

Limitation by Law of Gifts, Incomes and Inheritance; Property Taxation for State and Local Revenue; British System of Radio Control; Safety-Responsibility Plan of Automobile Insurance; Voluntary Domestic Allotment Plan; Federal Regulation of Electric Power Utilities; Dictatorship Versus Democracy; Capitalism Has Broken Down; Peace Is Impossible Under Capitalism; Stimson Doctrine of Non-recognition of Territory Acquired Through Violation of Treaties.

Vols. XII-XVIII. available. Contents furnished on request.

## CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL PROBLEMS:

### DISCUSSION SERIES

Three profound studies based on important college debate questions, these books are planned to provide the coach and his debate squad and classes with sound background material. Special features are: problems, required readings, and examinations.

Each book presents basic material on a problem of great social significance, and is a compilation of opinions of recognized authorities. They deal comprehensively with the underlying events that have preceded an existing crisis and discuss possible solutions from many angles. Bibliographies and review questions follow each chapter.

No.

1. Government spending and economic recovery.  
C. F. Phillips and J. V. Garland. 1938. \$2.
2. American neutrality problem. C. F. Phillips and  
J. V. Garland. 1939. \$2.
3. War and the Americas. J. V. Garland. 1940. \$2.

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



115 238

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY